

RELIGIOUS PERSECUTION IN EL SALVADOR

77604330

DEPOSITORY

HEARINGS

BEFORE THE

SUBCOMMITTEE ON

INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS

OF THE

COMMITTEE ON

INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

NINETY-FIFTH CONGRESS

FIRST SESSION

JULY 21 AND 29, 1977

Printed for the use of the Committee on International Relations

RUTGERS LAW SCHOOL LIBRARY
CAMDEN, N. J. 08102
GOVERNMENT DOCUMENT



94-999 O

U.S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE

WASHINGTON : 1977

OCT 22 1977

06-B8083

For sale by the Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office
Washington, D.C. 20402

Y4. In 8/16
R 27/2

COMMITTEE ON INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS

CLEMENT J. ZABLOCKI, Wisconsin, *Chairman*

L. H. FOUNTAIN, North Carolina
DANTE B. FASCELL, Florida
CHARLES C. DIGGS, Jr., Michigan
ROBERT N. C. NIX, Pennsylvania
DONALD M. FRASER, Minnesota
BENJAMIN S. ROSENTHAL, New York
LEE H. HAMILTON, Indiana
LESTER L. WOLFF, New York
JONATHAN B. BINGHAM, New York
GUS YATRON, Pennsylvania
MICHAEL HARRINGTON, Massachusetts
LEO J. RYAN, California
CARDISS COLLINS, Illinois
STEPHEN J. SOLARZ, New York
HELEN S. MEYNER, New Jersey
DON BONKER, Washington
GERRY E. STUDDS, Massachusetts
ANDY IRELAND, Florida
DONALD J. PEASE, Ohio
ANTHONY C. BEILENSEN, California
WYCHE FOWLER, Jr., Georgia
E (KIKI) DE LA GARZA, Texas
GEORGE E. DANIELSON, California
JOHN J. CAVANAUGH, Nebraska

WILLIAM S. BROOMFIELD, Michigan
EDWARD J. DERWINSKI, Illinois
PAUL FINDLEY, Illinois
JOHN H. BUCHANAN, Jr., Alabama
J. HERBERT BURKE, Florida
CHARLES W. WHALEN, Jr., Ohio
LARRY WINN, Jr., Kansas
BENJAMIN A. GILMAN, New York
TENNYSON GUYER, Ohio
ROBERT J. LAGOMARSINO, California
WILLIAM F. GOODLING, Pennsylvania
SHIRLEY N. PETTIS, California

JOHN J. BRADY, Jr., *Chief of Staff*

SUBCOMMITTEE ON INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS

DONALD M. FRASER, Minnesota, *Chairman*

MICHAEL HARRINGTON, Massachusetts
BENJAMIN S. ROSENTHAL, New York
LEE H. HAMILTON, Indiana
LEO J. RYAN, California

EDWARD J. DERWINSKI, Illinois
WILLIAM F. GOODLING, Pennsylvania

ROBERT B. BOETTCHER, *Subcommittee Staff Director*
THOMAS R. SMEETON, *Minority Staff Consultant*
JOHN P. SALZBERG, *Staff Consultant*
CLIFFORD P. HACKETT, *Subcommittee Staff Associate*
MARGARET E. GALEY, *Subcommittee Staff Associate*
ESTRELLITA JONES, *Subcommittee Staff Associate*
JOSEPHINE WEBER, *Staff Assistant*

CONTENTS

WITNESSES

Thursday, July 21, 1977:

	Page
Thomas E. Quigley, adviser for Latin America, Office of International Justice and Peace, U.S. Catholic Conference-----	2
Hon. Mary Rose Oakar, a Representative in Congress from the State of Ohio-----	5
Rev. Jose Inocencio Alas, priest of the Diocese of San Salvador (El Salvador, Central America)-----	6
Rev. James Richard, Jesuit priest from Austin, Tex-----	9
Hon. Ignacio E. Lozano, Jr., former U.S. Ambassador to El Salvador-----	11
Rev. Miguel F. Estrada, Jesuit priest, chairman of the priest senate of the Archdiocese of San Salvador-----	13

Friday, July 29, 1977:

Hon. William D. Rogers, former Under Secretary of State for Economic Affairs and former Assistant Secretary of State for Inter-American Affairs-----	30
Richard G. Arellano, Deputy Assistant Secretary for Inter-American Affairs, Department of State-----	32

MATERIAL SUBMITTED FOR THE RECORD

Statement by the Department of State concerning the Revolutionary Popular Bloc-----	51
---	----

APPENDIX

1. Additional statements submitted for the record:

Statement of John J. McAward, associate director, international programs, Unitarian Universalist Service Committee-----	55
Statement of Thomas J. Liggett, president, Christian Theological Seminary, Indianapolis, Ind-----	67

2. Statement by Archbishop Joseph L. Bernardin, president of the National Conference of Catholic Bishops, made on July 6, 1977, deplored the persecution of the Catholic Church in El Salvador-----

3. Material submitted by Father Richard:

Translation of the warning received from the White Warriors Union ordering Jesuit priests to leave El Salvador by July 20, 1977-----	71
Fact sheet on El Salvador with reference to attacks on the church and Jesuits-----	71
Press release issued by the Jesuit Conference on July 11, 1977, concerning a meeting of Secretary of State Vance with leading churchmen-----	72

Excerpts from a report entitled "Brief Analysis of Present Critical Situation in El Salvador Since the Agrarian Reform" prepared by Churchpeople in El Salvador-----	72
--	----

4. Press release of the Ministry of Defense and Public Security of El Salvador, dated July 19, 1977-----

85

INTERNATIONAL HUMAN RIGHTS

Other Documents in the Series

Human Rights in the World Community: A Call for U.S. Leadership. March 27, 1974.⁶ (Report of the Subcommittee on International Organizations and Movements.)

International Protection of Human Rights: The Work of International Organizations and the Role of U.S. Foreign Policy. August 1; September 13, 19, 20, 27; October 3, 4, 10, 11, 16, 18, 24, 25; November 1; December 7, 1973.⁸ (Hearings before the Subcommittee on International Organizations and Movements.)

Human Rights in Chile (Part 1). December 9, 1973; May 7, 23; June 11, 12, and 18, 1974.³ (Joint hearings by the Subcommittee on International Organizations and Movements and the Subcommittee on Inter-American Affairs.)

Treatment of Israeli POW's in Syria and Their Status Under the Geneva Convention. February 26, 1974.³ (Hearing before the Subcommittee on International Organizations and Movements and the full committee.)

Problems of Protecting Civilians Under International Law in the Middle East Conflict. April 4, 1974.³ (Hearing before the Subcommittee on International Organizations and Movements.)

Human Rights in Africa: Report by the International Commission of Jurists. June 13, 1974.³ (Hearing before the Subcommittee on International Organizations and Movements.)

Review of the U.N. Commission on Human Rights. June 18 and 20, 1974.³ (Hearings before the Subcommittee on International Organizations and Movements.)

Soviet Union: Human Rights and Détente. July 17 and 25, 1974.³ (Joint hearings by the Subcommittee on Europe and the Subcommittee on International Organizations and Movements.)

Torture and Oppression in Brazil. December 11, 1974.³ (Hearing before the Subcommittee on International Organizations.)

Human Rights in South Korea and the Philippines: Implications for U.S. Policy. May 20, 22; June 3, 5, 10, 12, 17, 24, 1975.³ (Hearings before the Subcommittee on International Organizations and Movements.)

Human Rights in Chile (Part 2). November 19, 1974.¹ (Joint hearing by the Subcommittee on Inter-American Affairs and the Subcommittee on International Organizations and Movements.)

Human Rights in South Korea: Implications for U.S. Policy. July 31, August 5, December 20, 1974.³ (Joint Hearings by the Subcommittee on Asian and Pacific Affairs and the Subcommittee on International Organizations and Movements.)

Human Rights in Haiti. November 18, 1975.¹ (Hearing before the Subcommittee on International Organizations.)

Human Rights in Chile. December 9, 1975.¹ (Hearing before the Subcommittee on International Organizations.)

Chile: The Status of Human Rights and Its Relationship to U.S. Economic Assistance Programs. April 29; May 5, 1976.¹ (Hearings before the Subcommittee on International Organizations.)

Psychiatric Abuse of Political Prisoners in the Soviet Union: Testimony by Leonid Plyushch. March 30, 1976.¹ (Hearing before the Subcommittee on International Organizations.)

Human Rights in Indonesia and the Philippines. December 18 and May 3, 1976.¹ (Hearings before the Subcommittee on International Organizations.)

Anti-Semitism and Reprisals Against Jewish Emigration in the Soviet Union. May 27, 1976.¹ (Hearing before the Subcommittee on International Organizations.)

See footnotes on following page.

Human Rights in the Philippines: Report by Amnesty International. September 15, 1976.¹ (Hearing before the Subcommittee on International Organizations.)

Human Rights Issues at the Sixth Regular Session of the Organization of American States General Assembly. August 10, 1976.⁴ (Hearing before the Subcommittee on International Organizations.)

Religious Persecution in the Soviet Union. June 24 and 30, 1976.¹ (Joint hearings before the Subcommittee on International Political and Military Affairs and the Subcommittee on International Organizations.)

Human Rights in Iran. August 3 and September 8, 1976.² (Hearings before the Subcommittee on International Organizations.)

Human Rights in Nicaragua, Guatemala, and El Salvador. June 8 and 9, 1976.¹ (Hearings before the Subcommittee on International Organizations.)

Human Rights in India. June 23, 28, and 29, and September 16 and 23, 1976.¹ (Hearings before the Subcommittee on International Organizations.)

Human Rights in Uruguay and Paraguay. June 17, July 27 and 28, August 4, 1976.¹ (Hearings before the Subcommittee on International Organizations.)

Namibia: The United Nations and U.S. Policy. August 24 and 27, 1976.¹ (Hearings before the Subcommittee on International Organizations.)

Human Rights in Argentina. September 28 and 29, 1976.¹ (Hearings before the Subcommittee on International Organizations.)

Human Rights in North Korea. September 9, 1976.¹ (Hearing before the Subcommittee on International Organizations.)

The Recent Presidential Elections in El Salvador: Implications for U.S. Foreign Policy. March 9 and 17, 1977.¹ (Joint hearings before the Subcommittee on International Organizations and the Subcommittee on Inter-American Affairs.)

Human Rights in East Timor and the Question of the Use of U.S. Equipment by the Indonesian Armed Forces. March 23, 1977.¹ (Joint hearing before the Subcommittee on International Organizations and the Subcommittee on Asian and Pacific Affairs.)

Human Rights in Cambodia. May 3, 1977.¹ (Hearing before the Subcommittee on International Organizations.)

Human Rights in the International Community and in U.S. Foreign Policy, 1945-76.¹ July 24, 1977. (Report of the Subcommittee on International Organizations.)

The Status of Human Rights in Selected Countries and the U.S. Response.¹ July 25, 1977. (Report of the Subcommittee on International Organizations.)

Human Rights in Taiwan. June 14, 1977.¹ (Hearing before the Subcommittee on International Organizations.)

Human Rights in Thailand. June 23 and 30, 1977.¹ (Hearings before the Subcommittee on International Organizations.)

¹ Document available from Government Printing Office, or from International Relations Committee.

² Document available from the International Relations Committee only.

³ Not available.

⁴ Document available from the Government Printing Office only.

RELIGIOUS PERSECUTION IN EL SALVADOR

THURSDAY, JULY 21, 1977

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS,
SUBCOMMITTEE ON INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS,
Washington, D.C.

The subcommittee met at 1:40 p.m. in room 2200, Rayburn House Office Building, Hon. Donald M. Fraser, chairman of the subcommittee, presiding.

Mr. FRASER. Today, the Subcommittee on International Organizations begins hearings on religious persecution in El Salvador.

There has been a growing conflict between the policies of the Government of El Salvador and the activities of the church. The church has become increasingly critical of the Government's policies regarding economic and social improvements of the country's peasants. This conflict between the church on the one hand and the Government and landowners on the other has sharply escalated in the last year in the form of verbal and physical assaults on members of the church, particularly the Catholic Church.

Incidents of torture, assassination and imprisonment of the priests have taken place. A recent incident was the killing of Father Alfonso Navarro in apparent revenge of the assassination of El Salvador's Foreign Minister.

On June 20 of this year, the White Warriors Union announced that all Jesuits who have not left the country by July 20 of this year would be systematically executed.

The United States has, for some time, provided military and economic assistance to El Salvador. However, in March of this year, El Salvador rejected further U.S. military aid, charging that this subcommittee's recent hearings on election fraud in El Salvador were an infringement on its sovereignty.¹

As I have stated before, the subcommittee is not seeking to tell the El Salvadoran Government how to run their country. Such a position would contravene U.S. policy as well as international law. However, the extent to which El Salvador respects freedom of religion as specified in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights should play a role in determining U.S. foreign policy for that country.

The present administration has on a number of occasions approached the El Salvadoran Government on the problems of human rights in its country.

¹See hearings held by the Subcommittee on International Organizations on Mar. 9 and 17, 1977, entitled "The Recent Presidential Elections in El Salvador: Implications for U.S. Foreign Policy."

We will hear testimony from persons who have closely followed and/or have firsthand knowledge of the religious situation in El Salvador.

They are: Congresswoman Mary Rose Oakar who has followed the problem closely; Father Jose Inocencio Alas, a priest of the Diocese of San Salvador; recently exiled to the United States; Father James Richard, an American Jesuit priest who recently returned from El Salvador; Mr. Thomas Quigley, adviser on Latin American Affairs of the U.S. Catholic Conference, who also recently returned from a trip to El Salvador; Hon. Ignacio Lozano, former U.S. Ambassador to El Salvador; and Father Francisco Estrada, a Jesuit Priest from El Salvador.

Mr. Richard G. Arellano, Deputy Assistant Secretary for Inter-American Affairs of the Department of State and William D. Rogers with the firm Arnold and Porter will testify on July 29, 1977 at 10 a.m.

Due to the large number of witnesses, I would like to remind the witnesses to keep their initial oral presentation to 6 minutes.

Congresswoman Oakar is scheduled to be here. She is not here so, we can begin with the other witnesses, and we will hear her testimony as soon as she arrives.

I presume it is understood by the witnesses that they will appear as a panel with Mr. Quigley being the first witness. So, if all of you will come to the table, we will begin

STATEMENT OF THOMAS E. QUIGLEY, ADVISER FOR LATIN AMERICA, OFFICE OF INTERNATIONAL JUSTICE AND PEACE, U.S. CATHOLIC CONFERENCE

Mr. QUIGLEY. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. My name is Thomas Quigley. I am adviser for Latin American Affairs in the Office of International Justice and Peace of the U.S. Catholic Conference. I am grateful for the opportunity of joining with other colleagues this afternoon in presenting testimony on the condition of human rights in El Salvador, with particular reference to the persecution of the church.

Two weeks ago, the president of the National Conference of Catholic Bishops issued a strongly worded statement of solidarity with the persecuted church and people of El Salvador. I have brought copies of this statement, and I respectfully ask that it be received for the record.

Mr. FRASER. We will make it a part of the record.¹

Mr. QUIGLEY. Archbishop Bernardin's statement briefly sketched the source of the present turmoil and the basis for the church's role within that highly conflicted situation.

In simplest form, there are two distinct realities, two sets of historic factors which must be understood. One is the nature of Salvadoran society, especially during the past decade: The smallest of the small Central American republics with the highest population density; a heavily agricultural economy in which the great majority of the rural people have no land of their own and a few wealthy families control vast areas of the arable land.

¹ See appendix 2, p. 69.

El Salvador, designated to be one of the showcases of the Alliance for Progress, did experience economic growth during the 1960's, but because this growth was not accompanied by a significant increase in the distribution of wealth among the various sectors and failed particularly to achieve an essential land reform, the lot of the vast majority has continued to deteriorate.

The other reality that must be understood, however schematically is that of the Catholic Church in today's Latin America. No student of the area is unaware of the historic assembly of Latin American bishops at Medellin, Colombia, in the fall of 1968. Medellin symbolizes the renewed commitment of the Latin American church to the essentially evangelical task of preaching the good news of liberation, of salvation, to the poor.

The Gospel is not to be preached in a vacuum but within the concrete context of people's lives. At Medellin, the bishops analyzed the situation of their continent and concluded that what most needed to be addressed were the "structures of domination" that kept millions of people in virtual servitude, the systematic injustices that the bishops characterized as "institutionalized violence," and "situations of sin."

The effects of Medellin were profoundly felt in virtually every country of Latin America and while El Salvador did not experience some of the more dramatic expressions of this renewal such as the various priests movements arising in other countries, the whole church of El Salvador gradually underwent a profound conscientization. Priests, religious, and teams of lay catechists, called Delegates of the Word of God carried on programs of prayer, study, and reflection throughout the rural areas as well as in the cities.

These church personnel, contrary to allegations by the Government and the landowners, neither incited nor led the campesinos in their struggles. Instances abound of attempts to the parish priests, including the martyred Jesuit, Father Rutilio Grande, to contain the justifiable anger and frustration of the peasants, to help them press for their rights in as nonviolent a fashion as possible. The campesinos are their own leaders; the priests, including especially the Jesuits, served principally to help the people to reflect on and articulate their needs.

But confrontation with the authorities, alined as they are with a traditionalist oligarchy determined to retain its privileged position, was inevitable. In 1974, for example, the bishops strongly protested the killing of several campesinos by the national guard in San Vincente. When a few months later in the same area the local pastor was arrested, beaten, and tortured, the bishop invoked the penalty of excommunication on all responsible.

Further killings occurred in July of that year (1975), bringing about stronger protests from the church and accusations by the Government that the church was a haven for Communists and that priests were encouraging demonstrations such as those protesting the Miss Universe contest.

By July of last year, however, the scene was set for a more intense and systematic confrontation. It was just a year ago that the Government announced a very modest land reform program, the Transfor-

macion Agraria. This program was so reformist and minimalist that parts of the campesino movements refused to support it, but the Jesuits at the Catholic University and through their influential journal, Estudios Centroamericanos, lent their full support; if skeptical of the Government's intention, they could at least praise the hoped-for results.

They had little opportunity to do so. The oligarchy organized such strong opposition to the Transformacion Agraria that by October the Government backed down and virtually canceled the program. Among those siding with the landowners against the Government was the Government's official Presidential candidate, Gen. Carlos Huberto Romero, now President.

The accusations especially against the Jesuits and the Archbishop began increasing around the end of the year so that the past 6 or 7 months in El Salvador have been a time of such vicious, sustained, cowardly, and systematic attacks upon the church itself as to be probably unparalleled in recent times.

You will hear today in the testimony of others and can read in the documentation we are asking to be received for the record the dramatic litany of these attacks: The arrests and expulsions, the bombings and threats, the beatings and killings of scores, some say hundreds, of campesinos.

These are attacks against the church, and against religion as such, in at least two distinct ways. The first is the obvious attack against the institutions of the church and its personnel: The beatings, arrests, expulsions, and killings of priests; the printed attacks against the Archbishop of San Salvador and the Episcopal Conference; the bombings of the Catholic University and the archdiocesan printing house; the threatened assassination of the entire Jesuit community.

The second, less obvious but no less insidious, is the denial not only of the social doctrine of the church but of the freedom of Christians to exercise their faith in accordance with that doctrine. Under the guise of defending a supposed Christian civilization, those in power in El Salvador both reject the church's authoritative teaching and prohibit others from living out their faith in everyday life.

On Sunday, June 12, together with several thousand others I participated in a solemn mass of reparation in the Metropolitan Cathedral in San Salvador. The service of reparation, not the first of its kind, was held to atone for the sacrileges committed by the security forces when they raided Aguilares May 19 and 20, broke open the tabernacle of the church and strewed consecrated hosts over the floor.

While the obvious focus of the reparation service, held on one of the church's principal eucharistic feasts, Corpus Christi, was this wanton desecration of the sacrament in Aguilares, the prayers and the archbishop's sermon made it abundantly clear that the "Santissimo" that had been violated was also the sacredness of the human person, the men, women, and children of Aguilares.

That the church is defending the rights of the campesinos as sacred rights; or that the bishops can say as they did in their message of May 20 that "the fate of these campesino compatriots of ours, the poorest of the poor, concerns us as much as or more than the injustice suffered by the expelled priests" is apparently too difficult for the wealthy and powerful to understand.

But they will have to understand that the church in El Salvador is profoundly united and fully committed to its evangelical mission which includes, as Pope Paul has expressed it—

the duty of proclaiming the liberation of millions of human beings, many of whom are her own children—the duty of assisting the birth of this liberation, of giving witness to it, of insuring that it is complete.

And they will have to understand too that the church in the United States as well as in many other countries is committed to doing everything possible to insure the freedom, the peace and the well-being of our fellow Christians in El Salvador.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. FRASER. Thank you very much, Mr. Quigley.

Our colleague, Congresswoman Mary Rose Oakar from Ohio, is present and has joined us here. Since we are taking her out of turn, she may as well present her statement from here.

STATEMENT OF HON. MARY ROSE OAKAR, A REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF OHIO

Ms. OAKAR. Thank you, Mr. Chairman, very much.

Mr. Chairman, I appreciate this hearing and being able to testify very much. I am sorry to go out of order, as it were; I know you understand that I am coming out of a meeting and I hope the Jesuits, at least, in the audience will forgive me, since I attended one of their graduate schools.

Mr. Chairman, this meeting has particular eminence if we are to believe the Washington Post story that said in this morning's paper that the Jesuits will stay despite the terrorist threat of death. I thank you and other members of the committee for allowing me to be here today.

I have chosen to address the subcommittee today because I believe that the situation in El Salvador is a grave matter with implications for religious freedom and social freedom throughout the world.

Today, Mr. Chairman, as we sit here, the Jesuit order in El Salvador is being subjected to a savage wave of terrorism. In fact, today is the announced deadline for Jesuits to leave El Salvador or face execution.

While this is not the threat of the El Salvador Government per se, it is the demand from a Government-tolerated terrorist group known as the White Warriors Union.

Who are these terrorists and why should their threats be given any credence?

Mr. Chairman, it is my understanding that this group is comprised of a group of radical zealots who believe the Jesuit order to be a haven for Communist thought and government subversion. This ill-conceived belief has led the terrorist group to commit a series of kidnaping and killings, as well as inducing the Government of El Salvador to take various official actions against the Jesuit order.

To date, the White Warriors Union has claimed responsibility for six bombings of the Jesuit-directed Catholic University in San Salvador. The terrorists have been linked to the kidnaping and killing of a Jesuit priest in May of this year. The group claimed responsibility for this act and termed it retaliation for the assassination of the El Salvadoran Foreign Minister whose death has been erroneously blamed on a Jesuit priest.

Beyond the terrorist activities, Jesuits have found the Salvadoran Government to be unsympathetic to their plight. In fact, seven foreign-born Jesuit priests have been refused reentry permits to El Salvador, and eight other priests have been expelled from the country.

Moreover, it has been reported that the government of Gen. Carlos Humberto Romero has become increasingly involved in active persecution of the Jesuit priests—including instances of torture and assassination.

The Jesuits are not a threat to General Romero's government. Nonetheless, when the Government reduced its agrarian reform programs to a level of ineffectiveness, the Jesuits spoke out. They criticized Government officials and powerful landowners. The price for this public expression has been death for some and fear for all.

The recent escalation in the frequency and intensity of these attacks on the priests and the church is due to the fact that these Jesuits are the staunch defenders of civil liberties and human rights in a nation where these qualities of life are becoming increasingly scarce.

Mr. Chairman, today as the subcommittee hears testimony on the situation in El Salvador, the Jesuit order is facing expulsion or elimination. I ask you to seek legislative solutions to this problem and to encourage the administration to find and use sanctions that will bring this reign of terror to an end.

This must be done, in view of the current situation, immediately. It is truly a matter of life and death.

One other reference that I would like to make—it appeared, again, in the Post in an article by Colman McCarthy and he quoted the El Salvador Archbishop Gonzalez who said of the Jesuits that to proclaim the Gospel's demands is not communism; it is a commitment to the Christian faith. What will the country's answer be to the misery of the common people? If we love God but our neighbor suffers, he is hungry, has no work, no land to cultivate, if his future is uncertain and his present also. We, who think we are Christians, must act.

In describing specifically what the Jesuits have been all about in El Salvador, I urge this committee to act. I think this is a very necessary hearing. I commend the chairman for having it.

Thank you.

Mr. FRASER. Thank you very much, Representative Oakar. That was a very forthright and clear statement.

We will return now to the panel, and our next witness is Father Alas.

STATEMENT OF REV. JOSE INOCENCIO ALAS, PRIEST OF THE DIOCESE OF SAN SALVADOR, EL SALVADOR, CENTRAL AMERICA

Father ALAS. My name is Jose Inocencio Alas. I am 42 years of age, a Salvadoran by birth, and a Roman Catholic priest in good standing.

I did my graduate studies in El Salvador, Canada, Rome, Belgium, and Ecuador. Ordained a priest in Rome in 1959. I then worked for 15 years in my country, 6 years primarily with middle and upper class Catholics and then 9 years with the peasants, especially in Suchitoto, an agricultural zone in an area of 45,000 inhabitants.

I wish to testify to you, gentlemen, about the violation of human rights in my country, something which goes on all the time, but is right now particularly serious. I make this testimony in order that the whole world can find out what is going on in El Salvador. Beyond the frontiers of any single country is the good of each and every person. Where there is one human who suffers, there ought we all to be.

My work, like that of many of my fellow priests, has had as its goal to present the vision of Christian faith through questioning the real situation in which the people, especially the peasants, live without either land or work. This, of course, presupposes some understanding of the situation in which our people live and a search with them for some solution.

Surely the most pressing problem in El Salvador is the problem of land distribution.

In the face of this situation we have struggled to make possible agrarian reform which has now been accepted by the Government of El Salvador. To make agrarian reform a reality, we have organized at both the local and the national levels, courses of information on agrarian reform—which, I emphasize, is now a program of the government—and we have come to see the need of peasant organizations.

I personally founded a school of agriculture where, besides teaching agricultural techniques, we informed the students about the agrarian reform and how to organize themselves to achieve its ends.

The consequences of this action have been the following:

In 1969, the city of Suchitoto was twice placed under siege by security forces in order to oblige me to abandon it; the peasants demanded that I stay with them, and I did.

In 1970, January 8: I participated as a delegate of the church in the first National Congress of Agrarian Reform convoked by the Legislative Assembly in El Salvador. Because I spoke out forcefully there in favor of the peasants, I was arrested by Government agents and, only on the way to prison, did I overhear that the order for my assassination had been revoked.

But, after forcing me to drink a full quart of pure alcohol, mixed with some drug, they left me abandoned, stripped, on a high mountain in the country. For 9 days I was unconscious in the emergency center, fighting for my life.

1971-77: Many threats of death against me; continuous propaganda against me in the press, on radio and television; an appearance in a court before a municipal judge charged with inciting the peasants against the President—I was acquitted; deliberate destruction of my parish house by a fire set by an arsonist; partial damage to my house from a bomb explosion; I was twice captured—once by national police and once by the national guard—and then released thanks to the timely action of two bishops, the clergy and the peasants.

Several times I have had to take refuge in the archbishop's house and finally in the house of the papal nuncio, from where I came to the United States and am now here as a refugee, thanks in part to the gracious help of Dr. Ignacio Lozano.

My case is not unique. Many of my companions have been captured for the same reasons. The most serious case is that of Father Rafael Barahona: captured in 1976 and again this year, we fear for his mental

health since he was brutally beaten and for a long time, in the general headquarters of the national guard.

Many priests, my friends, were expelled from the country after being interrogated: Father William Denaux, Belgian; Father Bernard Survil, United States; and Father Jorge Sarsaneda, Panamanian. Some others were expelled from the country, and yet others were abandoned on the Guatemalan frontier without identity documents and then were imprisoned by Guatemala for not possessing their documents.

The most serious events have been the assassinations of Father Rutilio Grande and Father Alfonso Navarro, with both of whom I worked for some years. Father Navarro was with me just an hour before he was assassinated. He came to see me at the archbishop's house, where I had taken refuge, after he had spoken with the private secretary of the President of the Republic. I was the first to receive the news of his death.

His admitted assassins were the White Warriors Union, an extreme rightist clandestine organization which is becoming more and more powerful. The Government of El Salvador has a responsibility to protect the lives and well-being of its people against such terrorist organizations. Father Navarro had worked, among other things, for civil rights, especially that democracy may live in my country.

Summing up, we present the following table of attacks on the people and the church of El Salvador: Two priests assassinated; five priests tortured; eight priests expelled; seven priests denied reentry; three priests obliged to flee their country; parish assistants, catechists, sacristans of parishes assassinated; clergy of San Salvador and San Vicente accused and calumniated in a mass-media campaign which began 7 months ago and still continues; many priests threatened with death and Bishop Rivera Damas forced to hide himself many times; peasants and priests afraid to sleep in their own houses.

In the successive massacres—for example, in 1977 alone: San Salvador, February 28 to March 1; San Salvador, May 1; Aguilares, May 19—at least 200 persons have died. To give you a final idea of what persecution against the church means, it is enough for me to quote from some flyers distributed and also broadcast on the radio: "Serve your country, kill a priest."

This became translated by the White Warriors Union into a concrete threat under which 47 Jesuits are now suffering. If they do not abandon El Salvador today, July 21, they will be systematically executed.

Why is the church persecuted? There is but one answer to this question: For locating itself, out of our belief in evangelical charity, on the side of the poor who make up 92 percent of the population. This situating of oneself on the side of the poor, what does it mean?

It means helping them articulate in their minds and in their actions the concept of human rights. This process can be and is called conscientization. This is what we bishops and priests in El Salvador have been doing since 1969.

Our point of departure has been the Bible, the Word of God, and we have made use of all the human sciences to carry out the task.

The goods of creation belong to all people. To monopolize these goods in the hands of a few people is against divine law, no matter

what human laws may say. We have supported the agrarian reform because we consider it good for everybody, and the same goes for any project whatever which means liberty for our people, which means enjoyment of human and civil rights. For this, we are persecuted.

Mr. FRASER. Thank you very much, Father.

Our next witness is Father Richard.

STATEMENT OF REV. JAMES RICHARD, JESUIT PRIEST FROM AUSTIN, TEX.

Father RICHARD. Mr. Chairman, my name is James Richard. I am a U.S. citizen, a Roman Catholic priest, member of the Society of Jesus. I was in El Salvador from August 14, 1976, until June 25, 1977, as an economist doing doctoral dissertation research and working for a private housing foundation which builds low-cost communities for the poor in El Salvador.

Currently in El Salvador there are 47 Jesuits. Around half are Central American. There are no U.S. Jesuits presently working there.

The Jesuits operate: One of the two universities in the country; a high school with 1,800 students; three churches; plus the miscellaneous works of low-cost housing, chaplaincies and radio schools.

The policy of the Jesuits has been to serve the people of El Salvador, especially the poor, within the context of the government of the country to bring about democratic modifications of social structures. This we have done openly and publicly through the legally constituted and recognized institutions I have just mentioned. I would like to cite two concrete instances.

The Jesuit university was the only institution to pronounce itself publicly in favor of the agrarian reform law which the President of El Salvador proposed, which was passed by the Salvadoran assembly, and which Colonel Molina and his administration attempted to initiate last year.

Consonant with its purpose of creating critical awareness, the university's journal devoted articles in four issues last year to analyzing the agrarian reform law and events surrounding it. These issues not only offered the views of the various authors, but included pages of straight documentation: the complete text of the original law, the decree of the national assembly, the statements of the leading organizations opposed to the law, the replies of the Government to those statements, and the pronouncements of other groups, and finally the changes in the law of October 1976.

Critical, well-informed opinion, careful analysis, and documentation—elements necessary for democratic decisionmaking at a momentous period in the country's history.

Second, before the killing of the pastor, Father Rutilio Grande, and the expulsion of his Jesuit associates in March-May of this year, the Jesuits worked in the semirural parish of Aquilares.

This parish is in an area which has had a history of tension between landless peasants and large landowners whose lands the peasants work.

Working in this tense climate for the last 5 years, Father Grande and his fellow Jesuits walked a careful middle line. On the one hand, they defended the legal right of the Salvadoran citizen to organize

to better his living. On the other hand, Father Grande wrote on November 1, 4 months before his murder, that his parish and his work would not be identified with specific groups—even those proclaiming themselves to be Christian—and certainly not with any political party. His work was to proclaim the Gospel and to enable the people to make themselves aware of the social reality in which they live.

The work of the Jesuits in the university and in the parish of Aguilares are two examples of Jesuit commitment to work legally toward social change for the betterment of the poor who are the vast majority of the Salvadoran people.

The response to this policy and actions has been the following:

(1) Six bombs have been set off in the Jesuit university. The White Warriors Union took responsibility. Two destroyed the editorial offices of the university journal and one did severe damage to the administration building.

(2) Three Jesuits were denied reentry into El Salvador, though two were nationalized citizens.

(3) Four Jesuits were arrested, imprisoned, mistreated and expelled from the country. In addition, three ex-Jesuits were expelled, one after severe torture.

(4) One Jesuit was murdered.

(5) The Jesuit parish church and rectory in Aguilares was pillaged and desecrated by the army.

(6) Even before my 10 months in El Salvador, the Jesuits, their university, the archbishop, various church institutions have been included in mounting attacks in the newspapers. These attacks are not news articles, but paid advertisements. A theme of these escalating attacks is that reform is a Communist threat and that people speaking in favor of reform are traitors.

(7) The Jesuits are currently under a death threat by an extreme right-wing paramilitary group, the White Warriors Union. I include the full text of the threat in my written statement. This threat announced in the press and on the radio, among other things, states:

All Jesuits without exception must leave the country forever within thirty days of this date (June 20, 1977) * * *. If our order is not obeyed within the indicated time, the immediate and systematic execution of all Jesuits who remain in the country will proceed until we have finished with all of them.

Further we warn: (A) all neighbors; (B) parents and students; (C) employees that, if as of the indicated date [July 20, 1977] there is disobedience, all Jesuit installations and places frequented by them will be considered military targets.

Since this warning has been made with sufficient anticipation, we will not be responsible for the death of third persons as a consequence of our operations.

Mr. Chairman, I wish to emphasize that the attack and threats on my brother Jesuits in El Salvador should not be seen in isolation from the testimony of Mr. Quigley or Father Alas. The poor of El Salvador, the Catholic Church there in the person of its archbishop are also involved.

For your purposes today, it may be irrelevant that certain threats of systematic murder have been made, that some forced expulsions have taken place, that bombs have exploded, that persons have been beaten and mistreated.

The point is that this pattern of terror and fear strikes at the heart of all human rights. What is significant here is that human rights—

the right to freely work within legally approved structures—are being systematically attacked in El Salvador.

Mr. Chairman, I suggest for your committee's consideration the following practical action:

The Congress of the United States should pass a joint resolution condemning the systematic violation of human rights in El Salvador and calling on the government of General Romero to take all necessary steps to protect its citizens—peasants, priests, and Jesuits—against illegal acts: terrorism, threats and violence.

The U.S. Government through the State Department should call in the Salvadoran Ambassador here in the United States to express in the strongest possible terms its concern over the systematic violation of human rights in El Salvador.

The U.S. Congress through your committee should maintain continued active interest in the response of the Salvadoran Government by action in the human rights situation in that country.

The U.S. Government should continue to adhere to its strong stand in linking bilateral and multilateral aid to human rights, certainly in the case of El Salvador.

The fundamental problem in El Salvador is land. The U.S. Government should take an active interest in and support agrarian reform in that country.

The problem of increased Salvadoran immigration in recent years to the United States is extremely delicate. I would hope that this committee would be an influence in future immigration legislation toward leniency and flexibility in this matter.

For example, the committee may create a working group of various interested parties who wish to help Salvadoran immigrants to this country in order to advise the committee and the Congress on this matter.

With your permission, I would like to submit several written documents for the record.

Mr. FRASER. We are glad to receive them. Thank you, Father.¹
Our next witness will be Ambassador Lozano.

**STATEMENT OF HON. IGNACIO E. LOZANO, JR., FORMER U.S.
AMBASSADOR TO EL SALVADOR**

Mr. LOZANO. I served as American Ambassador to El Salvador from August 30, 1976, to June 1, 1977. By way of background, when I arrived the current President, Gen. Carlos Humberto Romero, had already resigned as Defense Minister and was awaiting his nomination as candidate of the official political party, the PCN.

His predecessor, Col. Arturo Armando Molina, was at the time of my arrival, deeply embroiled in his ill-fated plan of agrarian reform, the so-called first project of the agrarian transformation program.

This program probably marked the beginning of the alienation which has developed between the Catholic Church and those conservative elements of the Salvadoran oligarchy represented by such organizations as ANEP, the private enterprise group, and more

¹ See appendix 3, p. 71.

notably, FARO, representing the agricultural sector, the group which would be most affected by an agrarian reform program.

On the one hand, we had young, socially conscious priests seeking on behalf of the campesinos a better way of life and a bigger slice of the economic pie brought on by booming coffee and cotton prices, and on the other hand the landowners, seeking to protect their own economic interests and reluctant to share their bonanza with their workers.

It soon became apparent that an accommodation had been reached between the ANEP and FARO groups and presidential candidate Romero, that if he withheld public support of President Molina's agrarian reform program, they would in turn provide massive financial support for his election campaign. And Molina, faced with violent opposition to his program from the oligarchy, and failing to muster much support from wary and distrustful campesinos, was forced to swallow the bitter pill and, for all practical purposes, scuttle his own agrarian transformation program.

Following the February 20 presidential elections, and the charges of massive fraud which accompanied them, the country entered into a period of growing political unrest, increasing terrorist activities, and greater repression by the Government of its own citizens. These conditions continued to worsen right up to the time of my departure.

The worst cases of terrorism during the 9 months of my service as Ambassador involved the kidnaping and assassination of two government officials, Director of the Salvadoran Institute of Tourism, Roberto Poma, and Foreign Minister Mauricio Borgonovo, both members of prominent and wealthy families; and the assassination of two Catholic priests, Father Rutilio Grande and Father Alfonso Navarro. None of the perpetrators of these four crimes had been discovered at the time of my departure.

During this period of great social unrest, numerous right-wing groups, including FARO, mounted a shrill campaign in the Salvadoran press against the Catholic Church, accusing its priests of contributing to and openly supporting this unrest, if not actually creating it by preaching revolution and subversion from their pulpits. This campaign of vilification apparently had the tacit approval of the Government, which in its turn was mounting a campaign of harassment and intimidation of Salvadoran priests, and the expulsion of foreign priests, including Americans.

As for my actions and those of the Embassy during this period, I made it a point to express my sympathy for the church and its hierarchy, for what I considered to be a totally unjustified campaign against it. At the same time we made strong protests against the treatment suffered prior to his expulsion from the country by an American priest, Father Bernard Survil. This was done through delivery of a diplomatic note.

We also delivered a note protesting the violation of international consular treaties by Salvadoran authorities during the detention of two American Mormon missionaries. I have no knowledge that the Salvadoran Government ever responded to these notes.

When another American priest, Father John Murphy, was harassed and intimidated by government security people, to the degree that he feared for his personal safety and decided to leave El Salvador, he

abandoned his parochial residence and spent his last several days in the residence of an Embassy officer, who later personally escorted him to the airport and saw him safely on his way to the United States.

I was in Washington on consultations at the time of Father Grande's murder, and I do not recall that any terrorist organization claimed credit for this crime. However, the White Warriors Union, a right wing terrorist group, attributed to itself the murder of Father Navarro and a 14-year-old boy who had the misfortune of being a visitor in the priest's home when gunmen shot them down.

As a point of information, my wife and I attended the funeral masses for Mr. Poma, Foreign Minister Borgonovo, and Father Navarro, to express our sympathy for all three victims of this senseless terrorism.

Near the end of my service as Ambassador I was visited by Father Higinio Alas, on behalf of himself and his brother Inocencio, who was in hiding, also in fear of his life. He brought a two-fold request.

First, that they be issued visas which would permit them to travel to the United States, and then on to Canada and Europe.

Second, that the Embassy use its good offices to determine if the Government would allow them to leave the country freely.

We made inquiries of the Minister of Defense and Public Security, who assured us that there was no detention order in effect against either of the Alas brothers. A day or two later they were escorted to the airport by the archbishop and the Papal Nuncio, and safely left El Salvador.

During all this time I was in frequent personal contact with the new archbishop, Msgr. Oscar Romero, meeting with him on several occasions, both in the Embassy and in his office. I also took advantage of a visit to the country of our desk officer, to make a highly visible visit to the Universidad Centroamericana "Simeon Canas," a Jesuit university. In addition, the rector of the university was a frequent guest at social functions in the Embassy residence.

This, Mr. Chairman, gives I think a pretty complete overview of our actions with regard to the campaign of persecution of the Catholic Church in El Salvador. I would be happy to answer any questions.

Mr. FRASER. Thank you very much, Mr. Ambassador.

Our final witness is Father Miguel Estrada. I believe that he will require an interpreter.

**STATEMENT OF REV. MIGUEL F. ESTRADA, JESUIT PRIEST,
CHAIRMAN OF THE PRIEST SENATE OF THE ARCHDIOCESE OF
SAN SALVADOR¹**

Father ESTRADA. My name is Miguel Francisco Estrada. I am 43 years old, a Salvadoran citizen, a Roman Catholic priest, and member of the Society of Jesus. I am presently chairman of the Priest Senate of the Archdiocese of San Salvador.

First of all, I want to express my complete agreement with the facts presented by Mr. Quigley, Father Alas, and Father Richard.

¹ Father Estrada's statement was given through Mr. Ted Herrera, an interpreter with Language Services Division of the Department of State.

For the purposes of being as objective as possible about this important matter and in order to bring things as up to date as possible, I wish to add some data regarding the first weeks of July 1977. I arrived yesterday at 4 in the afternoon, which possibly might be able to be interpreted as initial indications and signs of a bit of hope for the near future.

These are the following:

July 15: Special security measures were taken by the Government to protect Jesuit lives and institutions.

On July 15, 1977, 6 days ago, the creation of a bilateral high-level church-state commission. The group had its first meeting the day before yesterday, July 19, 1977.

The day before yesterday, July 19, the new administration of the Republic of El Salvador issued its first public manifesto, via the Defense Department condemning "violence and terror, no matter the source—be it from the right, the left, or from whatever sector."

I ask permission to submit the full text as part of my written testimony.¹

As you can understand, the above consists mostly of words and promises, though there have been some concrete actions. The question is whether the present Government of El Salvador will keep their promises.

Mr. FRASER. Thank you very much, Father. We will accept the full text, as you requested in your testimony.

Mr. Ambassador, let me raise a question with you, if I may, because you understand the general problems and attitudes of the Department of State.

We are continually confronted with the question of the appropriateness of a committee of Congress holding hearings on the internal affairs of other countries. You were actively serving as Ambassador, I think, during the time that we held hearings on the elections in El Salvador, which was a first for us; we had never attempted to examine this before.

At the time that we held the hearings, we raised the question as to whether, if indeed the allegations were true, that there was massive fraud in the elections, that this did not contribute to the prospect of a severe deprivation of what we call the fundamental rights involving the integrity of the person, problems of torture and detention, summary execution, disappearance, and so on. Nonetheless, the Government of El Salvador has made known, I think I saw through the press, at least, their belief that we are interfering in their internal affairs.

We justified the hearings here on the grounds that we have a responsibility for U.S. policy toward the country and what happens in the country may be relevant to the formulation of our policy.

What is your general view about this matter?

Mr. LOZANO. Mr. Chairman, I am inclined to agree with you. I think that we have a responsibility to look after the human rights and the well-being of our fellow human beings around the world, wherever we have diplomatic relations. And I think we would not be meeting our responsibilities if we chose to close our eyes to flagrant

¹ See appendix 4, p. 74.

violations against the dignity of our fellow human beings around the world.

Therefore, I think that I can say that I pretty much agree with the subcommittee's rationale in examining some of these things which may appear to be matters of the internal affairs of a country but which, in effect, really affect us all.

Mr. FRASER. With what instruments, leverage or pressures, can the United States constructively assist in protecting the lives of the Jesuit priests who have been threatened?

Mr. LOZANO. I think we are doing it by bringing it to the attention of the world, like we are doing in this hearing, all the publicity it is receiving, both here and around the world, and in other parts of Latin America.

It is difficult for us to directly look after the well-being of citizens that are not of the United States other than through moral persuasion, but I think by calling the attention of public opinion, hemispheric opinion, to what is happening to El Salvador is important.

Mr. FRASER. I have one additional question for you, but I would invite the others to respond as well.

The threat that prompted these hearings has come from the White Warriors Union. To what extent is it clear—or perhaps it is not clear—that the White Warriors Union is sanctioned or tolerated, or perhaps even given active support by the Government of El Salvador?

Let me phrase it more openly. What is the relationship, if any, between the White Warriors Union and the Government of El Salvador?

Mr. LOZANO. I cannot say that there is any direct relation, Mr. Chairman. However, I do feel that the atmosphere which has been created in El Salvador of incitation toward violence has, in many cases, had at least the tacit approval of the Government.

As I mentioned in my testimony, while I was there there was an organized campaign of vilification in the Salvadoran press against the church and against the Jesuits. At that time, the country was under a state of siege in which the guarantees of a free press were suspended, and it would have been very easy for the Government to put an end to this campaign in the press.

As a matter of fact, in a conversation I had with the Under Secretary of Foreign Relations who at that time was Acting Secretary after the assassination of the Foreign Minister, where we were discussing the importance of the various sectors of the country beginning some form of reconciliation with the change in government and taking advantage of the opportunities presented by the change of administration, I pointed out that I thought an excellent place to start would be to bring an end to the rhetoric which was inciting the violence. I cannot say that there is any direct relation between the Government and the White Warriors Union but I think that the tolerance of the Government to campaigns which encourage terrorists groups such as the White Warriors Union or the FPL, that is something I think the Government could act upon, but has not chosen to.

Mr. FRASER. Are there other members of the panel who would like to express their views on the relationship between the White Warriors Union and the Government?

Father RICHARD. I would add one thing to what the Ambassador has said. There have been six bombings at the Jesuit University and then the death of Father Navarro, all publicly claimed by the White Warriors Union, in addition to the present threat against the Jesuits.

The thing that I notice myself is that it has been a pattern of threats actually carried out and none of those responsible have been tracked down and found. The six bombings were never solved. Father Navarro's death was never solved. And I am unaware that steps have been taken to solve the threat against the Jesuits.

In fact, I just heard Father Estrada's testimony. It called my attention to the fact that the Government has just acted during the last week to a threat that has existed for a month now and have just recently taken steps to protect the Jesuits.

What I am indicating, Mr. Chairman, is that there seems to be a pattern, as Mr. Ambassador has said, of nonsolution of threats made and carried out, and this pattern I think has some relevance here.

Father ALAS. All I can say is that the people in my country, the people that we meet in the street, they believe that the White Warriors Union has some support, especially from the militarists who are not in the army. Really, I do not know if that is true or not.

I was working 15 years in my country and I met many people, especially rich people, who were openly speaking about the necessity to have something like that, and they were speaking about it to get ready to prepare it. I do not know really. I think that the White Warriors Union, especially the branch armed group of the landowners, are supported by the Government. That I can say.

Mr. FRASER. How long has the White Warriors Union existed?

Father ALAS. It began after the Foreign Minister was kidnaped, but before that we had some fliers that spoke about the Philangists. And in the newspapers, the Catholic Church was speaking against these Philangists. I think they are the same.

So I think that 12 years ago, it was coming, and now when the problems are really worse, after the program of agrarian reform, they are killing now.

Mr. FRASER. Father Estrada.

Father ESTRADA. I think that, by definition, the UGB is a clandestine group and therefore it is very difficult to get certain facts, true facts, regarding its origin, its connections and so forth.

However, through their actions we can reach certain conclusions which are, more or less, with a basis, and therefore credible.

As far as I am concerned, the activities of this White Warriors Union up to now are of a shade of extreme rightist. Other than this, there is nothing that I could add which I could be certain of.

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Ambassador, your period of service in El Salvador covered, I think you indicated, a period of approximately a year, was it?

Mr. LOZANO. Nine months.

Mr. FRASER. For those actions that you took, or proposed to take, in relation to human rights and related issues in El Salvador, what kind of support did you get out of Washington?

Mr. LOZANO. Well, Mr. Chairman, little to none. We operated pretty much on our own in this area. The most important case to us involved

the disappearance of an American citizen while in the custody of Salvadoran authorities, and we felt that we had a great difficulty in getting Washington to focus on this particular case which we considered to be of extreme seriousness.

I feel that it did not get the attention that it deserved here until after we went public on it down there. I do not mean to imply by my answer that the concerns for human rights, as expressed by this administration, are not sincere, but in the particular case of El Salvador, being a small country as it is, and given the fact that the United States really has no vital interest in the country, it is pretty difficult to get anybody to pay attention to us.

Finally the violation of human rights has become so flagrant and of such concern all over the world by the campaign against the Catholic church and in other instances, all of a sudden the attention of the world is focused on this little country.

Mr. FRASER. This is not the first instance that it has come to the subcommittee's attention of a small place apparently losing any standing with respect to human rights as far as our Government is concerned.

I do not mean to overstate, but we have encountered other areas of the world where, because they are small, apparently their human rights do not appear to be of much interest to our Government.

Is there any difference between the two administrations with respect to either instructions to support or the opposition you got?

Mr. LOZANO. I would not say so, Mr. Chairman. Things, of course, did not really begin to deteriorate until after President Carter took office. He took office in January. The elections in El Salvador were in February.

Other than the by now famous *Richardson* case that began to develop in October of 1976, the general climate as far as human rights in El Salvador did not begin to deteriorate until after the Carter administration was in place. It would not be fair to me to compare the Carter administration with the former administration as far as its concern for human rights was involved.

Mr. FRASER. One last question. What is the significance of the name of the group, "White Warriors Union." Does that have some historical antecedent or some particular meaning within El Salvador?

Mr. LOZANO. I think throughout the hemisphere traditionally right wing terrorist organizations are usually called, they are usually somehow connected with the color white, "The White Glove," the white this, the white. I suppose that is why they picked this name in El Salvador.

Perhaps one of our Salvadoran witnesses could better answer that.

Father ESTRADA. As an antecedent to this matter of the name and following what was said by Mr. Lozano, in Guatemala we have "The White Hand," which coincides in the color. And the actions of this group in El Salvador and Guatemala are the same.

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Koch.

Mr. KOCH.¹ Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

It intrigues me, Mr. Ambassador, how did a nice, humane, conscientious guy like you become an Ambassador?

¹ Congressman Edward I. Koch, a Representative in Congress from the State of New York.

Mr. LOZANO. Appointed by President Ford, you mean?

Mr. KOCH. Exactly.

Mr. LOZANO. We all make our mistakes.

Mr. KOCH. I might say that the testimony that has been given is extremely moving and probably the best that I have heard on any of the human rights cases because it involves people who themselves were in part directly the subjects of indignity and assault. I am really moved by it, particularly as I think back to what we just went through on the floor of the House when we tried to cut out military aid to Nicaragua for comparable reasons. There we were faced with statements which I am going to allude to now, because similar statements will be made here in defense of the situation—they were wrong there, they will be wrong here. I also want to get your thoughts on how to deal with that.

The first thing that will be said is, as they said in Nicaragua where the archbishop and all of the bishops signed a pastoral letter denouncing torture and rape by the National Guard of the civilian population, that those making the charges are radical priests. I do not happen to be Catholic, but I have never heard of the Jesuits referred to as "radical priests."

Will I have that to contend with on the floor? Shall we reach that point? Will that accusation be supportable?

Let me pursue it by asking this. The group of Jesuits that are here now, and who are involved, have you been disowned by the Jesuit order outside of El Salvador?

Father RICHARD. How do you mean?

Mr. KOCH. Is what you are doing consonant with the Jesuit obligations that you have? Have any one of you been censured for taking on some cause that is not a concern of, that is not approved by the Jesuit order?

Has what you are doing in any way been censured by the head of the Jesuit order? Does he know what you are doing? Does he approve of what you are doing?

Father RICHARD. Let me say in response, let me cite two concrete instances. Our Father General in Rome sent a check for \$5,000 after the university was bombed for about the fifth time. Again, it was a symbolic gesture to demonstrate his solidarity with the Jesuits then in El Salvador, of which I was a member.

Second, Father Grande was killed Saturday evening. We were sitting together in one of the Jesuit communities on Sunday morning when the phone rang and I picked it up, and it was obviously an Italian voice of a long distance operator trying to get in touch with the Jesuit Provincial—he happened to be in the community at that time—and took the call and there was a very amicable conversation between Father Provincial, who is the head of all of the Jesuits in Central America, and Father General in Rome. Father General cited the incident that now Father Grande was the fifth Jesuit to die violently this year. Three Jesuits died, I believe, in Rhodesia, and one Jesuit died in Brazil violently.

Father General has been quite open and quite clear in his letters of complete support of the Jesuits and their work in Central America, in complete support.

Mr. KOCH. Thank you.

The second allegation that will be made, because it was made in the matter of Nicaragua, and again was as fallacious there as I am sure it is here, is that when Members of Congress such as the chairman, myself, and others take on a cause like this, in some way or other we are helping communism.

Could you address yourself to that, or maybe you, Mr. Ambassador, because it relates to the fear that when we support those who object to an existing government engaged in repression of alleged revolutionaries, when we object to inhuman treatment being used by a government, that somehow or other we are assisting the expansion of communism.

Do you want to address yourself to that?

Mr. LOZANO. It is pretty much like the story that we used to hear in San Salvador, Mr. Koch, that the Government has four enemies: The political opposition, the Christian Democratic Party, the Catholic Church, the left wing terrorist groups and the U.S. Embassy, and they lumped us all into the same category.

I suppose to a large extent it is our own fault, because we in the United States made such a thing about communism as a real threat to Latin America for such a long period of time that while we no longer perceive communism directed from Cuba or from the Soviet Union or mainland China as that much of a threat, I think President Carter said that in a speech not too long ago, that the forces of oppression in Latin America have adopted this as a rationale for oppressing their people.

If you are against them, or if you disapprove of what they are doing, they label you a Communist.

Mr. KOCH. Father Alas, if I may, the third allegation that was made in the debate on Nicaragua, and linking that with this situation—it was false then, it will be false here—is that there are really only two groups, one is the insurrectionists, the Communists, and the other is the Government, no matter how right wing it is, and that given that choice, the United States, in order to somehow or other protect its interest must come down on the side of the right wing, even a radical right wing, because the radical left wing is a greater threat, and there really is nothing in between.

Would you tell us if you would, Father, what are the democratic forces in El Salvador that I hope are in between these extremes?

Father ALAS. I think that it is not true that in this country, in my country especially, that there are only two forces, the leftists and the rightists. The rightists, that is the extreme right, I think that in my country that there are many people, not only in the church, that are working for a real democracy. We believe that it is not necessary to be a Communist to give the possibility to the persons, to the workers, to the people who work.

It is not necessary to be a Communist to have a better life, and many people in my country believe that. The thing is, in my country, some families have all the power. They are planters—coffee, sugar—the same people are bankers, the same people are into industries.

In 1960, when they began this program of the U.S. alliance, the Alliance for Progress, I know that many of the moneys coming from here to there, this money was not going into the hands of the workers,

but especially to the rich people. This money, through the national bank, was going to the banks.

Always when we speak about the necessity, really, to have a true democracy, about the necessity of having an increase, that everyone must have it, they are always speaking that we are Communists. They say that the Democratic Party is Communist. They say that the Catholic Church is Communist. They say that the former archbishop of El Salvador was a Communist; the new one is a Communist; that we are Communists.

This is the easy way to take over the people. They need slaves. That is the true thing.

Mr. KOCH. Would you agree with me—and this is one of the responses that I gave on the floor in my Nicaraguan debate—that when the United States associates itself with a government which engages in oppression, we make Communists out of people.

Do we not give a special status to the Communists, that they do not deserve, when we, the United States, allow the proposition to be made that it is only the Communists who are in opposition to the repressive government?

What I am trying to convey is that it is not in the interests of the United States to identify with a rightwing oppressive government but rather, with that broad, middle democratic force in a country which wants humane treatment.

Father ALAS. I believe that when the United States is giving its support to the rightist government that we have in my country, or in Nicaragua, too, that you are doing the best to grow the Communists in my country, in all of these countries.

When this Government, this country is helping these people, that it is the best for my people, the peasant and the worker, to believe that this country with the rightists, that it is necessary. It is a necessity to fight against this country, imperialism, and against the right in my country. That they believe.

Mr. KOCH. One concluding question.

What is the size of the revolutionary force that the Government says are seeking to take over? What is the dimension of the terrorist activity on the left?

Father ALAS. Really, I do not know. I believe that there are not that many, I believe, and I believe that if my Government continues to support the landowners, the bankers, and all of these people, maybe it will grow, because for the peasant especially, they have nothing to eat, they have nothing to be dressed with. They have nothing to lose if they are fighting for their life, so they are asking for a way—it is necessary. They will die the same, if they are not fighting, because they are hungry.

My country, as the United Nations says, is the second country in Latin America that has the problem of hunger and it is the fifth country in the world, El Salvador, for really poor people. What does it matter to fight? It is better: no? Than to go to bed with a stomach empty. It is better to do something.

Mr. KOCH. Mr. Ambassador, when you were there, could you tell us what was the size, the dimension of the insurrectionists, those that the Government said that it needed to suppress with the tactics that it has engaged in?

Mr. LOZANO. The best guess would be not more than a couple of hundred.

Mr. KOCH. What is the number of people in El Salvador?

Mr. LOZANO. About 4.5 million.

Mr. KOCH. Was that insurrection an activity that was assisted by outside countries, so far as you know? Is there a Cuban linkup with arms or people that you know of?

Mr. LOZANO. Not to my knowledge.

Mr. KOCH. Would you be in a position to state whether the insurrectionist activity is a domestic group as opposed to a foreign group?

Mr. LOZANO. Yes; I think so. I might add—

Mr. KOCH. You think it is what?

Mr. LOZANO. That it is a domestic manifestation.

As far as acquisition of arms by the terrorists, they are very well-fixed financially because they received such tremendous ransoms in some of the kidnapings over the years, millions of dollars, actually, and I am sure that they can equip themselves in illicit international arms markets.

Mr. KOCH. I have no other questions, Mr. Chairman. I just want to reiterate what I said at the beginning that this testimony is extremely impressive. I want to commend each of you for coming to this committee today to provide us with your information. I am sure that it is your hope and my hope, and everybody in this room, that something will be done, whether by us or through supernatural forces, to protect the well-being of the Jesuits in that country.

Mr. FRASER. Father Richard, I see in the statement that you prefaced it with an outline and under 5c, you referred to military aid, but in looking at your statement itself, I do not find a direct reference to military aid.

Father RICHARD. Let me specify that a little bit further, Mr. Chairman. I understand from talking to the staff of the subcommittee that in the current budget under consideration by the Congress, there are two items for military aid to El Salvador. One was for \$2.5 million for foreign military, FMS, foreign military sales. I believe that has been deleted because the El Salvadoran Government refused to receive such aid.

There is another item of \$600,000 for military training. I would hope that the Congress, through the influence of your committee, would deny the \$600,000 in military assistance for military training to the El Salvadoran Army.

Mr. FRASER. What relationship do you see between the military training and the problems that we are talking about here today?

Father RICHARD. The army in El Salvador has been—well, let's put it this way, for the last 40 years the successful candidate for the presidency of El Salvador has been a military man. It would seem to me that unless the United States, through the Congress and/or the State Department takes some firm action, with a bite in it, the El Salvadoran Government simply is not going to believe that the U.S. Government's interest in human rights means anything.

These are people who are well used to saying words but not deeds. Father Alas has alluded to that. There are many Government promises, but they are often not kept.

I would assume that the tendency for the El Salvadoran Government would be that the U.S. Government's concern about human rights is just words and not deeds. The item of \$600,000 is a relatively small item, but it is symbolic. If this were denied because of the motivation of human rights, it will have a certain bite to it, and the message will come home to the El Salvadoran Government that the U.S. Government really does mean business.

Mr. Chairman, the word credibility means a lot to me—and when President Carter—and I was in El Salvador when President Carter came out again and again to talk about human rights—the reaction of the people I was with was, well, let us see. We have heard a lot of high-flown words by the United States before. Let's see whether the President of the United States means what he says, and the Government of the United States means what they say.

It would seem to me that this would be a clear indication on the part of the U.S. Government over a relatively small matter monetarily that we do mean business.

So I would very heartily recommend that this committee consider the denial of that \$600,000.

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Ambassador, could you throw any additional light on the nature of this problem?

Let me enlarge a little bit. On the question of the military aid, or military training, what is happening? We admit the United States has in El Salvador an image of proclaimed concern about human rights? Where are we going on this?

Mr. LOZANO. Mr. Chairman, if there were a witness from the Pentagon here, I am sure that he would say our military exerts a moderating influence on the military in El Salvador and other Latin American countries through its contacts, training programs in the Continental United States or the Canal Zone or through the presence in all these countries of our military groups and what have you.

We have no way to judge how much better or how much worse the Government of El Salvador would be if it had not been exposed to this moderating influence by our military.

But I am inclined to think that our training programs are useful, that they do establish a contact between our military and their military.

I think what is much more difficult to justify is the presence of large military groups in El Salvador and other Latin American countries and in the particular case of El Salvador, meaning the Embassy's, was getting the El Salvadoran Government which, of course, is military, to face up to the fact that when it wanted to deal with the United States it had to deal with the Embassy, with the civilian people in the Embassy, and they much preferred dealing with the military group. They feel more comfortable.

I think that a smaller profile as far as our military presence in the country is concerned would be of benefit to the United States, but I also feel that some continuation of military training programs is useful because of the contacts that are established through these training programs.

Mr. FRASER. What about the point that Father Richard makes of credibility, if we profess concern about human rights, and there are

serious violations that have occurred. Where do we come down on the issue of credibility?

Mr. LOZANO. If you separate our military training programs from military sales, military assistance, it is very easy—it is academic in the case of El Salvador, because they beat us to the punch in rejecting security assistance, but I think we could maintain our credibility in the human rights area by taking the initiative if they had not beaten us to it in withdrawing military assistance and perhaps continuing training programs.

I really think we should maintain flexibility and not have it all black or all white, and base our actions on our direct concern for what is happening in the particular country involved. If we determine that we have no choice, where maybe the human rights violations in one particular country are not as bad as in others, or to cut everything out because that is our policy or that is our law, I think perhaps there we might lose credibility by putting everything on an either/or basis, regardless of the extent of the violations to human rights involved.

Mr. FRASER. What about economic assistance?

Mr. LOZANO. I feel very strongly that it would not be to the benefit of the United States to cut off economic assistance that is directly affecting the poor anywhere. I equally feel that, to use our leverage in international financial institutions to directly affect the poor is not to our benefit.

A case in point. In El Salvador, the Jesuit university has a request in to the Government for approval of a \$9 million loan application to be submitted to the Inter-American Development Bank for us. If the Government approves that and it does come to the IDB and the United States votes against it is it adversely affecting the people whose human rights are being violated in El Salvador?

Mr. FRASER. They would not necessarily fit the category of needy people.

Mr. LOZANO. No.

Mr. FRASER. What you would argue indicates the reason that there needs to be some flexibility?

Mr. LOZANO. Exactly, there are other needs, in fact, in these developing countries.

Mr. FRASER. Would any of the other witnesses want to comment on these issues we have covered in the last few minutes?

Father ESTRADA. I would like to comment on this last question regarding general economic aid. I want to underline that one must determine who is going to be the ultimate receiver of all of this economic aid or economic loans, because there are programs that are truly of benefit to the people and there is a danger of falling in the ambiguity of trying to express a different point of view to the Government and that the people who really need the help are the ones who are going to pay the bill.

As an El Salvadoran, I would like to insist on this.

Mr. FRASER. Father Richard.

Father RICHARD. I would just like to add one thing in connection with what Mr. Lozano has mentioned, that if our Government is serious about human rights and wishes to continue military aid and training assistance to these countries, I think it should select very carefully

the military men representing this country in those countries. I think they should be selected very carefully and trained very carefully to be very sensitive to the social dimensions, the social context, of the country in which they work.

My fear is that they have tunnel vision and they become mere technocrats. I think they need a real social sensitivity and that should be one of the chief criteria of selection of these people.

But I fear that the general tendency is to quite often concur with the repressive policies of the military government that they are advising and whose programs they are concerned with.

I agree with Mr. Lozano that we should be flexible and we should go on a case-by-case basis, a country-by-country basis. The principle here is that we have to somehow conduct military assistance with human rights. Consequently, the people who represent the military in those countries have to be very conscious of the social climate in which they work and not have tunnel vision.

Mr. FRASER. I do not understand the Ambassador's argument against reduction or termination of military assistance, but the continuation of training may be of some value.

You referred to the tendency of the Government to refer to the military group and using them to communicate with our Government. What about Father Richard's reference to the military group?

Mr. LOZANO. That is one of the dangers of having a military group in the first place. Perhaps they have a tendency to perceive the same kinds of subversive threats that the Government does because of their background or training, or whatever.

In our case in El Salvador specifically, one of the problems, or one of the potential problems, I think, is the fact that our military group is headquartered in the military headquarters rather than in the Embassy.

Mr. FRASER. Whose military headquarters?

Mr. LOZANO. Their military headquarters.

Mr. FRASER. Of the military?

Mr. LOZANO. That is where they work 8 hours a day, supposedly. Now, I understand the legislation is being changed that we will do away with military groups and we are going to go to an Office of Defense Cooperation, and that it will be at the discretion of the Ambassador where they will work, and I would certainly recommend in our case particularly—and I have—that our Office of Defense Cooperation be in the Embassy rather than in the military headquarters.

If I say so, having an arm's-length situation with the military there, rather than giving at least the appearance that we are as one.

Mr. FRASER. I do not mean to overdramatize this, but I heard it said by a responsible person that the real way to send a signal to our friends in Latin America is to get the Pentagon advised and interested in the human rights concerns. Is there any truth to that?

Mr. LOZANO. I think that the Pentagon is involved, Mr. Chairman. I understand that General McAuliffe, the commanding general of the Southern Command in the Canal Zone, is a strong champion of human rights and has publicly so stated.

Mr. FRASER. I invite you to comment on these issues, Mr. Quigley.

Mr. QUIGLEY. I don't claim any special expertise in the field of military assistance, Mr. Chairman, but I believe that on the face of it

this is the area in which the need for flexibility in U.S. foreign policy seems to be the least. If flexibility is maintained in a whole variety of other areas including that of economic assistance, the military relationship, especially because of the recent history of Latin America, is one that the United States could well afford not to be saddled with.

I agree completely with Congressman Koch's and your own perception that the United States has an unfortunate image throughout Latin America in this regard. It is very much repeated in statements, including statements that are made by church groups, that the United States has the image of being the purveyor of their arms, their military equipment, training, and so on, that have seemed, if not the ultimate cause, the root cause of the problem, at least the instrumentality, or instrumental cause.

There is very little evidence, if any, that would suggest that because of the close connection and degree of contact between the U.S. military and the militaries of Latin America and the existence of the School of the Americas and various other kinds of programs which are designed to either democratize or improve in some ways on the performance in a good sense of the military in Latin America, there is very little evidence that it has succeeded at all.

All we do have as evidence is a continued deterioration of the democratic process in Latin America in one country after another, especially in most recent years when the military relationship has been the most intense. This has been a move from merely military-style governments to more authoritarian, dictatorial, and repressive regimes.

It would be very difficult for anyone in the Pentagon to demonstrate that there were enough pluses to warrant any continuation of that kind of a program. As we continue to collect the statements from the bishops of Latin America on this theme, the increasingly insistent point is made that the whole process of militarization of the continent has to be somehow reversed. And it is not going to be reversed unless there is less training, less military assistance from abroad, less commercial sales, and so on.

So that I would say the position of many people within the church in Latin America as well as here is not to find very much merit in the argument for continued, even selected continued, military assistance.

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Smeeton.

Mr. SMEETON. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

During the last week I have received a number of reports from a variety of sources alleging that the White Warriors Union is tied in some way to the Government security forces. Some going so far as to suggest its membership included quite a few retired military officers.

I wonder if any of you today could provide me with any information which would document these charges?

Father ESTRADA. Regarding providing documents, a couple of days ago the President responded expressly to this question and he obviously denied that this actually existed in the country.

However, it is obvious that this is one of many rumors that exist regarding the roots or the mechanism of this group.

If you would like the document of this interview that was made when the President was interviewed on the subject, I do have a copy of it.

Mr. SMEETON. Yes; I would, thank you.

In today's Washington Post there is a rather extensive article written by a journalist by the name of Karen de Young regarding some of the problems that the Jesuits are encountering in El Salvador. Among other things, she notes that a source close to the Government says that the fear is that if the rightists do not assassinate, the leftist guerrillas will. Then she goes on to quote the same source as adding, "It is a golden opportunity, because the rightists, and hence the Government, will be blamed."

Based on your own experiences, observations, and knowledge, are there any grounds for such fears?

Father ESTRADA. This is more than a mere speculation. I do not think that this is valid. I think that it is thinkable, but whether it could happen, this is something that I seriously doubt. This is my own personal opinion.

Mr. SMEETON. Mr. Ambassador, perhaps you would be in the best position to answer this question. How would you rate the human rights performance of El Salvador vis-a-vis its Latin American neighbors? Have you had an opportunity to serve in other Latin American countries?

Mr. LOZANO. No; this was my only crack of being ambassador, and I really have no knowledge about what is happening in other parts of Latin America other than what I read in the press.

I hope that it is worse in El Salvador. I do not think it would be tolerable to think that it is that bad all over.

I am inclined to think at the moment that it is worse in El Salvador than any of its neighbors. We have yet to see what might come of that in Guatemala as Presidential elections approach.

Besides the example in Nicaragua, I would think that the situation in El Salvador is worse than any of its neighbors.

Mr. SMEETON. It touches more elements of the body politic?

Mr. LOZANO. Yes.

Mr. SMEETON. It is just not targeted against one element, it is pervasive?

Mr. LOZANO. Yes.

Mr. SMEETON. Now that you are no longer ambassador, maybe you are free to speak openly on this. If you were Secretary of State of the United States, what would be the major elements of your foreign policy for Latin America, in general, and El Salvador, in particular?

Mr. LOZANO. A meaningful economic policy, assistance in creating markets for their products, using our moral persuasion in the area of human rights. Perhaps not allowing ourselves to be so closely identified with repressive regimes, as we have in the past.

I think what Latin America needs most is economic development, obviously. I think that it is important that we help them.

Mr. SMEETON. You speak of a meaningful economic policy. Does that imply that you do not think it has been too meaningful?

Mr. LOZANO. I do not think they have the markets for their products in the United States that perhaps they should have. They certainly have not had the markets that they perceive they should have, so maybe we could take some steps in that direction.

Mr. SMEETON. Thank you.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Ambassador, to follow that question, the impression that I get in El Salvador—and I also have that impression about other countries—is that there are internal structural obstacles that make economic development difficult. Landholding may be one of those.

As I gather it—and I am no expert on Latin America—where the government represents the establishment of people who are already wealthy or well off and there is no real possibility of democratic change, how is economic development going to take place?

Mr. LOZANO. Obviously, in a country like El Salvador, per capita income means nothing because of the distribution of that income. Obviously, El Salvador needs a better distribution of its income. In today's economic conditions in which it has had a bonanza because of international commodity prices for its products, the poor are not sharing in that bonanza. I do not think that they are any better off now than when coffee was 69 cents a pound. Because of its demographic problems, it needs industrialization, but industrialization is meaningless if it has no markets for its products.

One of the problems is its shortsightedness with regard to its conflict with Honduras. Honduras was a great market before the 1969 war and yet there does not seem to be any great pressure, any great urgency on the part of El Salvador to resolve that conflict.

Obviously, we cannot be more Papist than the Pope, and we can only do so much. We certainly should encourage things there to get settled and encourage economic development by the countries themselves, not necessarily through our economic aid exclusively.

Father ESTRADA. I do not know whether what I have to say will be well-received or not. Regarding the economic development of the countries of Latin America or El Salvador, there is a general feeling there that if the United States helps us, it takes 98 percent out and leaves only 2 percent.

Technicians tell me that there are statistics, and I do not have them at hand, that would prove economic affirmation such as this, but what I would like to leave with you in a clear manner is that this type of economic problem be studied carefully to provide the desirable solutions.

Otherwise, we would be condemned to permanent underdevelopment or at least at a very slow development.

Mr. FRASER. Have you had any difficulties from these right wing groups or from the Government?

Father ESTRADA. Personally?

Mr. FRASER. Yes.

Father ESTRADA. You said from the extreme right?

Mr. FRASER. Yes.

Father ESTRADA. Nothing major, at least now. We, the Jesuits, have worked traditionally with the wealthy class, preferably. But now, with the new line within the Jesuit movement of not only promoting the faith, but of helping those who need help, many of those who are our friends or our students are now perhaps our worst enemies, and I have noticed that personally I am no longer invited to their homes. Moreover, they do not even speak to me any more.

That is, for now.

Mr. FRASER. What do the Jesuits in El Salvador plan to do with regard to the announced program of Jesuit extermination that is supposed to begin today?

Father ESTRADA. We plan to remain there, taking certain prudent measures for our own security, but not carrying these to any extreme that would impede us in carrying out our dedication, which is to carry out the ideals of the order of the Jesuit company, which is above and beyond safety. That is, our personal safety.

Mr. FRASER. I want to reiterate Congressman Koch's statement that this testimony today has been extraordinarily forceful and impressive in the impact that it has made on us. I know that the State Department has already made some representations to the El Salvadoran Government on this matter, but it is a matter that will remain of intense interest to this subcommittee.

Are there any last comments?

Father RICHARD. I would just like to add something, Mr. Chairman. I, myself, have been surprised at the importance that these hearings have had in El Salvador. I do not mean to denigrate the hearings, but hearing from my fellow Jesuits in El Salvador, I have been literally amazed at the power that these hearings have had in that country.

I would indicate to you and to the committee in general that I sincerely believe that these hearings have saved lives, and they have saved the lives, some of the lives, I am sure, of my Jesuit brothers there, and I would hope that they would save the lives of some of the peasants there who are really the people we are serving in El Salvador.

So I can emphasize, Mr. Chairman, that I, myself, have been surprised at the importance of these hearings and I hope that you and your committee are well aware that they do have much importance in that country, much importance. And so I really plead with the committee that you maintain your active interest in this issue. If not, then I am quite myself convinced that people will die.

Mr. FRASER. Thank you.

Are there any further comments?

If not, I want to express my appreciation to all of you. You have been enormously helpful to us this afternoon, and I appreciate your patience.

[Thereupon, at 3:50 p.m., the subcommittee adjourned, to reconvene Friday, July 29, at 10 a.m.]

RELIGIOUS PERSECUTION IN EL SALVADOR

FRIDAY, JULY 29, 1977

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS,
SUBCOMMITTEE ON INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS,
Washington, D.C.

The subcommittee met at 10:18 a.m. in room 2255, Rayburn House Office Building, Hon. Donald M. Fraser (chairman of the subcommittee) presiding.

Mr. FRASER. Today the subcommittee resumes its consideration of religious persecution in El Salvador and the implications for U.S. foreign policy.

On June 20 a paramilitary group known as the White Warriors Union announced that all Jesuit priests who had not left the country by July 20 would be systematically executed. Fortunately, this threat has not been carried out and the Government has taken measures to protect the Jesuits.

The immediate problem of protecting the lives of Jesuits has been resolved for the present. However, the long term issues of human rights in El Salvador are still outstanding including, in particular, the social and economic injustices which pervade Salvadoran life.

Underlying the dissatisfaction with the present Government is convincing evidence that the Government of President Romero assumed office through fraudulent elections. At hearings in March, this subcommittee received evidence of the fraud, including taped recordings of National Guard instructions to its units on the procedures for carrying out the fraud.

Following the elections there were widespread demonstrations which were brutally suppressed by the Government, a state of siege was invoked and restrictions upon human rights were established.

The questions which the subcommittee would like addressed at this session is what measures has the Department of State taken to impress upon the Government of El Salvador our concern for the violations of human rights, and what additional measures are recommended.

The United States has maintained close relations with the Government of El Salvador, so much so that our military group is located in the headquarters of the Salvadoran Armed Forces.

Our former Ambassador to El Salvador spoke of the intimate relationship between our military group and the military forces of El Salvador which, he asserted, detracts from the effectiveness of the Embassy. He also indicated that in the past the Department has given little support to the Embassy with respect to human rights matters.

We are pleased to welcome the two witnesses appearing here today. Hon. William D. Rogers served as Under Secretary of State for Economic Affairs in 1976; from 1974-76 he served as Assistant Secretary for Inter-American Affairs. He has been actively involved in inter-American affairs for a considerable period of time.

Richard G. Arellano was recently appointed as Deputy Assistant Secretary for Inter-American Affairs. Prior to taking this position he was professor of international business and finance at the University of New Orleans and served as director of the International Marketing Institute.

I understand it is agreeable, Mr. Rogers, for you to proceed first. Glad to have you here.

STATEMENT OF HON. WILLIAM D. ROGERS, FORMER UNDER SECRETARY OF STATE FOR ECONOMIC AFFAIRS AND FORMER ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF STATE FOR INTER-AMERICAN AFFAIRS

Mr. ROGERS. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I am grateful for the invitation to be here today.

The subcommittee by its consideration of the situation in El Salvador, in my view, has already made an important and positive contribution to human rights.

The three Jesuit fathers who testified here on July 21 were speaking from vividly direct knowledge of the facts. What I know is only second hand, but I am honored that I might help by a few words in supplement of what they had to say.

It was Father Timothy Healy, president of Georgetown University, who brought me into this matter. He and Father James Connor, president of the Jesuit Conference, together with a number of other religious leaders in this country, became determined to express their concern over the attacks on the Catholic Church, and, in particular, the Jesuit Society in El Salvador by right wing terrorists, with the announcement on June 20 by the Union Guerrera Blanca, the White Warriors Union, that it would systematically assassinate all Jesuits who did not leave El Salvador "forever" within 30 days.

Father Healy and I accordingly met with the Chargé d'Affaires of the Salvadoran Embassy to communicate the interests of this group in the response of the Government to the threat.

On July 8, several members of the group met with Secretary Vance and a number of other State Department officials, including Ms. Derian and Assistant Secretary Todman.

On July 19, President Romero said in an interview with the Associated Press that he condemned violence "from wherever it comes," and cited this passage from his inaugural address:

My government does not seek violent confrontation with anyone, but it will exercise vigorously society's right of legitimate defense to preserve, protect and maintain peace among its members.

The following day, on July 20, the spokesman for the Department of State welcomed the President's statement but reiterated its "deep concern" over the announced threat to the Jesuits in that country.

It seems to me that these extraordinary circumstances in El Salvador represent an important test of the effectiveness of the effort to preserve and protect human rights in this hemisphere.

The Jesuits have, from the record, been attacked in El Salvador because they have tried to speed the pace of social and economic reform and modernization. There is no evidence that they have worked in any way other than through the legitimate channels.

Their efforts in El Salvador are but another example of the remarkable fact that the Catholic Church, and its constituent orders, are increasingly in the front of ranks of those institutions and groups working for development and social justice in this hemisphere.

I was first impressed with the humanistic goals of Catholicism in the Americas, and its significance to the struggle for growth, during my term as Deputy U.S. Coordinator of the Alliance for Progress in the sixties.

I participated in Rome in a series of meetings in connection with the Second Ecumenical Council in 1964. With Dr. Edgar Berman, at that time a colleague in the Alliance, I had a private audience with Pope Paul to discuss the church's role in the modernization of Latin America.

The church's position on Latin American reform was crystallized a few years later in the assembly of Latin American bishops in Medellin, Colombia, which firmly aligned itself with the speedy but legitimate change of traditional social and economic structures throughout the hemisphere.

Since Medellin, the church in Latin America has become a remarkably significant factor in the effort toward modernization in country after country of the Americas.

The witnesses who appeared before you on July 21 were living examples of the ways in which the church is working for the enhancement of human rights and the human personality in Latin America.

As Father Connor said in his July 23 response to the letter of July 21 from the Secretary of State:

The long-term good for El Salvador, of course is a social, economic and political order wherein all members of that society can live and work with freedom, justice and equality of opportunity. It is to this goal that the Churches and Jesuits in El Salvador are committed. Jesuits and other churchmen in this country will be working to assist this long-term Salvadoran effort of reorganization.

All men of good will, in El Salvador and in the United States, stand united in their commitment not to permit such humane and charitable efforts to be stopped by violent illegitimate vigilantism.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. FRASER. Thank you very much, Mr. Rogers.

There is another vote on. We will take another brief recess and then we will hear from you, Mr. Arellano. I am sorry about this. I hope this is the last vote for a while.

[Whereupon a short recess was taken.]

Mr. FRASER. The subcommittee will resume its sitting.

Mr. Arellano, I am sorry for this delay, I should indicate I am told everything that happens over there may lead to a record vote. There may be further interruptions, but we will do the best we can.

**STATEMENT OF RICHARD G. ARELLANO, DEPUTY ASSISTANT
SECRETARY FOR INTER-AMERICAN AFFAIRS, DEPARTMENT OF
STATE**

Mr. ARELLANO. Mr. Fraser, I have two statements, one which is substantially longer. It is for the record. If you do not mind, I have an abbreviated statement.

Mr. FRASER. Fine, we will put the longer one in the record.

Mr. ARELLANO. Your subcommittee is examining the situation of clergymen in El Salvador—a situation brought into high relief by the recent terrorist threat to kill Jesuits remaining in that country.

At your invitation, I am pleased to be here for the Department of State to speak about our concerns and policy related to this and other human rights issues of importance in our relations with El Salvador.

In March of this year, before a joint session of your subcommittee and that of Congressman Yatron, we reported upon human rights in El Salvador, primarily with respect to political and related civil liberties.

At that time, El Salvador was overshadowed by the unsettling aftermath of a controversial Presidential election. This included charges of fraud and mass demonstrations protesting the election outcome. Security forces dispersed the protestors with several deaths occurring in the process. A state of siege was in effect temporarily suspending certain constitutional rights.

Those rights included freedom of speech, assembly, movement, and private correspondence. Given these circumstances, we attempted to assess the "normal" state of affairs in that country as well as specific human rights concerns related to the elections.

Since March, and even prior to that, a number of incidents have been changing the complexion of human rights situation in El Salvador. These incidents have derived from, and been part of, three major acute developments:

The first of these being the violence surrounding the election and its aftermath which I have previously noted;

The second, a marked increase in terrorist activities by both rightist and leftist extremists, and Government reactions to this threat; and third, increased focus and criticism directed at priests, especially Jesuits, related to their exhortations and activism for socioeconomic reforms.

The unfortunate merging of these developments has contributed substantially to the current atmosphere of tension, insecurity, and polarization which prevails in El Salvador today.

Various speculations have been made about the linkage of the rightist and leftist terrorist groups to other elements in El Salvador. There are those who assert that ex-military or Government officials are involved in the White Warriors Union. Others claim that some Government officials have used the cloak of leftist groups to hide purely criminal activities.

The Government of El Salvador contends that some former clerics are part of extreme leftist terrorist groups. We are unable to substantiate or disprove the accuracy of these allegations.

I would like now to turn to the problem of church-state estrangement in El Salvador. The Government of El Salvador has accused the

church and priests of becoming involved in political affairs. It charged that the clergymen's exhortations for reforms contribute to subversive, leftist actions aimed at undermining the security of the country.

In the past year, primarily since the sensitive February election period, some 15 priests have either been expelled from El Salvador or refused reentry. At least three, the two Alas brothers and an American priest, Father John Murphy, left on their own, fearing for their safety.

The Government has said that the excluded or deported foreign priests had engaged in subversive activities in El Salvador.

In addition, several priests have been arrested, some charging physical and verbal abuse while in the custody of the national police or National Guard.

I might add parenthetically that as far as we can see, most of the accusations of human rights violations have been directed at the security police rather than at the armed forces.

There are other factors which augment tensions in El Salvador. One of these has been the growing dissatisfaction of campesinos over the Government of El Salvador's lack of progress on long promised agrarian reform.

Another factor augmenting tensions in El Salvador has been the growing dissatisfaction of campesinos over the Government of El Salvador's lack of progress long promised. Former President Molina, throughout his campaign and most of his tenure as President, endeavored to launch a meaningful agrarian transformation project. This was vehemently opposed by private sector elements.

In late 1976, the status quo advocates apparently prevailed as the agrarian reform was presented to the legislative assembly in a much diluted version. It has not been passed to date.

With this as backdrop, hundreds of squatters occupied land near El Paisnal in April, demanding changes in land rent distribution. After several weeks, the Government forces moved in to evict the squatters in mid-May.

As far as we know, there were no casualties resulting from that operation. There is, in fact, evidence that human rights discussions took place among the military, preceding the carrying out of this action.

However, 2 days later there was a massive roundup of people in nearby Aguilares as the Government sought instigators of the peasant actions. Three priests were among those arrested. There were also at least eight persons killed—two on the Government side. Reports of additional deaths have been received from nongovernment organizations, including some in testimony to the committee.

Thus, campesino confrontation with Government forces, the active support of clergymen for socioeconomic changes, and the Government's sensitivity to opposition which they often equate to subversion have interacted to create a climate of insecurity and tension.

The matrix for virtually all of these problems is basically the skewed nature of El Salvador's socioeconomic structure. El Salvador is the most densely populated country in the Western Hemisphere. Its per capita income is the fifth lowest of the Latin American and Caribbean nations.

A very small percentage of the population possesses a disproportionately large percentage of the land. A small circle of wealthy fam-

ilies controls the bulk of the country's resources. The quality of life for large numbers of persons is generally just tolerable. Landlessness and high unemployment with underemployment feed the discontent of the masses.

I would like to turn now to the scene as of the new administration in El Salvador. President Carlos Humberto Romero was inaugurated on July 1. With his ascension to power, came an end to the state of siege in force since the end of February. He has indicated his intent to pursue socioeconomic reform. He has made conciliatory gestures toward the church.

We understand, for example, that a joint church-state commission has been formed to cope with the differences between the religious community and the Government. He has taken vigorous measures to protect the Jesuits threatened by the White Warriors Union.

Through his Minister of Defense and Public Security and through his own statements to the press, President Romero has deplored terrorism of any ilk—rightist or leftist.

He has also stated that all Salvadoran political exiles can return to that country. We hope that these initial steps constitute the first of many actions by the Government of El Salvador to improve the human rights situation in that country.

I would like to turn now to U.S. actions and policy. The U.S. Government has maintained a strong human rights stance throughout this unsettled period in El Salvador.

Repeatedly, upon instructions from Washington, the Embassy has made formal demarches, sent protest notes and otherwise actively sought to impress upon Salvadoran authorities and others the abiding concern of the American people and Government with the human rights ramifications of developments in El Salvador.

Complicating our bilateral relations have been two principal matters. In recent months, we have been disturbed by a number of problems of consular access to and questionable treatment of Americans when detained by Salvadoran authorities.

Protest notes concerning such cases have been presented to the Government of El Salvador. This week we received reply to those notes, stating that Salvadoran personnel are being instructed to comply strictly with the 1963 Vienna Convention provisions concerning consular access and treatment of detained persons.

The other issue affecting our bilateral relations in recent months has involved the case of a missing American believed killed in El Salvador. For some months we have been seeking a satisfactory response from the Government of El Salvador regarding his fate.

Yesterday our Embassy received the detailed report of the Salvadoran Attorney General's investigation of the case. The results of that investigation did not provide concrete evidence sufficient for establishing criminal liability and taking the case to court.

However, the Government of El Salvador has presented its apologies for what may have happened, despite its inability to establish what in fact did occur. The Government of El Salvador has also assured us that the new administration will take all measures and precautions to avoid situations which can affect the traditionally good relations that have existed between the two countries.

Our human rights scrutiny of El Salvador in the wake of its controversial election led to El Salvador's renunciation of future U.S. security assistance, with the Government of El Salvador charging that we were interfering in internal matters.

We recognize the sovereignty of El Salvador and do not propose to tell its Government how to run its internal affairs. Nonetheless, we have persistently expressed our concerns to the Government of El Salvador about violations of fundamental human rights which we believe transcend geographic and political boundaries.

Most recently, we made several demarches concerning the terrorist threat against the Jesuits and actions to protect them. We were concerned by the initial public reticence of the Government of El Salvador after the threat was made.

Later, we were pleased to note the protective measures taken by the Government on behalf of the Jesuits and the statements of Salvadoran authorities denouncing all forms of terrorism.

We are aware of the abridgement of internationally recognized human rights in El Salvador from the time of the February election to the assumption of office by President Romero on July 1. We are anxious to work with the Salvadoran Government to prevent the trend of an anomalous, unsettled period becoming a continuing part of normal Salvadoran life.

We are prepared to pursue diverse means of stimulating improvement in the human rights situation in El Salvador.

We would like to be constructive in our approach. The advent of a new regime in that country may present us with new opportunities for cooperation in dealing with both the immediate, acute problems and the longer range, more endemic conditions. However, we must bear in mind that the complexities of engendering meaningful change in any society are immense.

As Deputy Secretary of State Warren Christopher has said:

If we are to do justice to our goals, we must act always with a concern to achieve practical results. * * *

I can assure there will be no diminution of resolve by the U.S. Government in addressing human rights issues with the Government of El Salvador. We would like to have them join in a cooperative pursuit in that regard. Our commitment to fundamental rights of all individuals remains firm.

We recognize some of the valid concerns of the Government of El Salvador. We also are keenly aware of the inequities and just grievances which underlie pressures for socioeconomic reform in that nation.

We are certainly aware of the instances of terrorism which have occurred in El Salvador. Yet we shall always maintain that, in the words of Secretary Vance, "the surest way to defeat terrorism is to promote justice in our societies—legal, economic and social justice." It is with that premise and moral logic that we wish to conduct our relations with El Salvador and all countries.

I will now try to respond to questions you may have.

[Mr. Arellano's prepared statement follows:]

PREPARED STATEMENT OF RICHARD ABELLANO, DEPUTY ASSISTANT SECRETARY FOR
INTER-AMERICAN AFFAIRS, DEPARTMENT OF STATE

Your subcommittee is examining the situation of clergymen in El Salvador—a situation brought into high relief by the recent terrorist threat to kill Jesuits remaining in that country. At your invitation, I am pleased to be here for the Department of State to speak about our concerns and policy related to this and other human rights issues of importance in our relations with El Salvador.

In another session, on July 21, you received an extensive cataloguing of recent incidents in El Salvador which have raised human rights questions. I would like to describe the overall human rights climate in El Salvador, as we see it—noting some of the salient recent developments as well as more fundamental, chronic factors. I shall also comment upon attitudes toward and treatment of priests in that country in recent months. Finally, I will describe our actions and policy toward El Salvador in light of these conditions.

In March of this year, before a joint session of your subcommittee and that of Congressman Yatron, we reported upon human rights in El Salvador, primarily with respect to political and related civil liberties. At that time, El Salvador was overshadowed by the unsettling aftermath of a controversial presidential election. This included charges of fraud and mass demonstrations protesting the election outcome. Security forces dispersed the protestors with several deaths occurring in the process. A state of siege was in effect temporarily suspending certain constitutional rights. (Those rights included freedom of speech, assembly, movement and private correspondence.) Given these circumstances, we attempted to assess the "normal" state of affairs in that country as well as specific human rights concerns related to the elections.

Since March, and even prior to that, a number of incidents have been changing the complexion of the human rights situation in El Salvador. These incidents have derived from, been part of, three major acute developments:

(1) The violence surrounding the election and its aftermath which I have previously noted;

(2) A marked increase in terrorist activities by both rightist and leftist extremists, and government reactions to this threat; and

(3) Increased focus and criticism directed at priests, especially Jesuits, related to their exhortations and activism for socio-economic reforms. The unfortunate merging of these developments has contributed substantially to the current atmosphere of tension, insecurity and polarization which prevails in El Salvador today.

During the past year or so, there has been an increased number of assaults against government officials and the wealthy elite of the country. Notably, one of the large landowners was killed in December of 1976; Director of Tourism Roberto Poma, generally acknowledged as being among the more progressive members of the upper class, was kidnapped and killed around the end of December 1976; and Foreign Minister Mauricio Borgonovo Pohl, also one of the more Liberal-minded elite, was kidnapped and murdered in April/May of this year. Policemen and National Guards have been attacked and killed. Deputies of the legislative assembly have been threatened as have various sectors of the community of the "14 families" in control of the country's economy. An octogenarian former President of El Salvador, Col. Osmin Aguirre y Salinas was recently shot down in front of his home. Leftist terrorist groups principally the FPL (Fuerzas Populares de Liberacion—or Popular Liberation Forces) and the ERP (Ejercito Revolucionario Popular—or People's Revolutionary Army) have claimed responsibility for these actions.

Government reaction to perceived threats from the left climaxed in mid-May when government troops swept into the rural areas of El Paisnal and Aguilares. The Paisnal action was aimed at thousands of peasant squatters, the latter resulted from a search for evidence of arms and other evidence of subversive activity.

Rightist terrorists have meanwhile launched a campaign of intimidation and attacks against clergymen who have been outspoken or active in efforts to improve the lot of the poor, mainly rural, masses. Notably, they have killed two priests, Father Rutilio Grande and Father Alfonso Navarro, and threatened

others. Roman Catholic institutions have been bombed at least six times. And, as well known, the entire Jesuit community was recently confronted with a terrorist ultimatum to leave El Salvador or be killed. The main rightist terrorist group which has claimed responsibility for these actions calls itself the Union Guerrera Blanca (UGB), or the White Warriors Union. As far as we can determine, this group was formed in late 1976 in response to leftist terrorist actions.

Various speculations have been made about the linkage of the rightist and leftist terrorist groups to other elements in El Salvador. There are those who assert that ex-military or government officials are involved in the White Warriors Union. Others claim that some government officials have used the cloak of leftist groups to hide purely criminal activities. The Government of El Salvador contends that some former clerics are part of extreme leftist terrorist groups. We are unable to substantiate or disprove the accuracy of these allegations.

Thus, the past several months have been unsettled, in the face of a series of crisscrossing assaults, bombings, kidnappings and murders by extreme left and right elements. At the same time, other, related factors have exacerbated the uncertainties in El Salvador. Some are of recent vintage, others more intrinsic to the Salvadoran setting.

CHURCH-STATE ESTRANGEMENT

The Catholic Church and priests in El Salvador have been increasingly criticized by rightist groups and by the Government of El Salvador as well. Since the 1968 Medellin Conference, and following in the footsteps of Pope John XXIII, the Roman Catholic Church has been committed to improving the material as well as spiritual lot of the poor and oppressed in Latin America. In addition, Pope Paul VI's *Evangelii Nuntiandi* has provided evangelical guidance directed at the concrete needs of the underprivileged. As we understand it, this approach has been adopted by clergymen in El Salvador particularly in the past three years. For example, since 1974, Father Inocencio Alas and his brother, Higinio Alas, have been in the forefront of efforts to have campesinos demonstrate and otherwise press for improvement of their conditions—that is, higher minimum wages, more favorable land rent arrangements and land redistribution. Thus, priests in El Salvador have, comparatively recently, become more active in working for socio-economic reform in that country.

The Government of El Salvador accused the Church and the priests of becoming involved in political affairs. It charged that the clergymen's exhortations for reforms contribute to subversive, leftist actions aimed at undermining the security of the country. In the past year, primarily since the sensitive February election period, some 15 priests have either been expelled from El Salvador or refused reentry. At least three, the two Alas brothers and an American priest (Father John Murphy), left on their own, fearing for their safety. The Government has said that the excluded or deported foreign priests had engaged in subversive activities in El Salvador. In addition, several priests have been arrested, some charging physical and verbal abuse while in the custody of the National Police or National Guard. (As far as we can see, more accusations of human rights violations have been directed at the security police, rather than the armed forces.) The estrangement between the Church and State was symbolized by the absence of the Archbishop of San Salvador from the July 1 inauguration of the new President.

PEASANTS AND AGRARIAN REFORM

Another factor augmenting tensions in El Salvador has been the growing dissatisfaction of campesinos over the Government of El Salvador's lack of progress on long-promised agrarian reform. Former President Molina, throughout his campaign and most of his tenure as president, endeavored to launch a meaningful agrarian transformation project. Large landowners and private sector elements vehemently opposed efforts for agrarian reform. FARO (Frente Agropecuario Regional Organizado—or Organized Regional Agricultural Front), a group of landowners originally in the Eastern region and later of national scope, was formed by landowners to protect their property interests, with their lives if necessary. It is believed that FARO has subsidized the strong media criticism against the Catholic Church and priests. Another important group, ANEP (Asociacion Nacional de Empresas Privadas—or National Association of Private Enterprises) also did not support the agrarian reform. In late 1976, the status quo advocates apparently prevailed as the agrarian reform was pre-

sented to the Legislative Assembly in a much diluted version. It has not been passed to date. Campesino disappointment and impatience were heightened by this development.

With this as backdrop, hundreds of squatters occupied land near El Paisnal in April, demanding changes in land rent and distribution. After several weeks, the government forces moved in to evict the squatters in mid-May. As far as we know, there were no casualties resulting from that operation. There is, in fact, evidence that human rights discussions took place among the military, preceding the carrying out of this action. However, two days later there was a massive roundup of people in nearby Aguilares as the Government sought instigators of the peasant actions. Three priests were among those arrested. There were also at least eight persons killed—two on the Government side. Reports of additional deaths have been received from non-government organizations, including some in testimony to the Committee.

Thus, campesino confrontation with government forces, the active support of clergymen for socio-economic changes, and the Government's sensitivity to opposition which they often equate to subversion have interacted to create a climate of insecurity and tension.

The matrix for virtually all of these problems is basically the skewed nature of El Salvador's socio-economic structure. El Salvador is the most densely populated country in the Western Hemisphere. Its per capita income is the fifth lowest of the Latin American and Caribbean nations. A very small percentage of the population possesses a disproportionately large percentage of the land. A small circle of wealthy families controls the country's resources. The quality of life for large numbers of persons is generally just tolerable. Landlessness and high unemployment with under employment feed the discontent of the masses.

Meanwhile, certain individuals, in particular the few active members of the PCES (Partido Comunista de El Salvador—or Communist Party of El Salvador), and other groups have despaired of working change through the political system. For over 30 years, the Government of El Salvador has been headed by various military figures, with the support of the rich elite. Since its inception in 1961, the government party, the PCN (National Conciliation Party), headed by military figures but with civilian participation, has held the reins of government. In 1972, opposition groups joined forces to support a presidential candidate. In 1976, the opposition boycotted the legislative elections, charging unfair electoral procedures. In 1972 and 1976, as in 1977, the opposition coalition charged that electoral fraud deprived them of a true opportunity to win.

President Carlos Humberto Romero was inaugurated on July 1. With his ascension to power, came an end to the state of siege in force since the end of February. He has indicated his intent to pursue socio-economic reform. He has made conciliatory gestures toward the Church. We understand, for example, that a joint Church-State commission has been formed to cope with the differences between the religious community and the Government. He took vigorous measures to protect the Jesuits threatened by the White Warriors Union—placing patrols and guards around the priests and their institutions. Through his Minister of Defense and Public Security and through his own statements to the press, President Romero has deplored terrorism of any ilk—rightist or leftist. He has also stated that all Salvadoran political exiles can return to El Salvador. We hope that these initial steps constitute the first of many actions by the Government of El Salvador to improve the human rights situation in that country.

U.S. ACTIONS AND POLICY

The United States Government has maintained a strong human rights stance throughout this unsettled period in El Salvador. Repeatedly, upon instructions from Washington, the Embassy has made formal demarches, sent protest notes and otherwise actively sought to impress upon Salvadoran authorities and others the abiding concern of the American people and Government with the human rights ramifications of developments in El Salvador.

Complicating our bilateral relations have been two principal matters. In recent months, we have been disturbed by a number of problems of consular access to and questionable treatment of Americans when detained by Salvadoran authorities. Protest notes concerning such cases have been presented to the Government of El Salvador. This week we received reply to those notes, stating that Salvadoran personnel are being instructed to comply strictly with the 1963

Vienna Convention provisions concerning consular access and treatment of detained persons. Also the Government of El Salvador's reply includes assurances that it will be careful to adhere to those provisions in the future. The other issue affecting our bilateral relations in recent months has involved the case of a missing American believed killed in El Salvador. For some months we have been seeking a satisfactory response from the Government of El Salvador regarding his fate. Yesterday our Embassy received the detailed report of the Salvadoran Attorney General's investigation of the case. The results of that investigation did not provide concrete evidence sufficient for establishing criminal liability and taking the case to court. However, the Government of El Salvador has presented its apologies for what may have happened, despite its inability to establish what in fact did occur. The Government of El Salvador has also assured us that the new administration will take all measures and precautions to avoid situations which can affect the traditionally good relations that have existed between the two countries.

In addition, our human rights scrutiny of El Salvador in the wake of its controversial election led to El Salvador's renunciation of future U.S. security assistance, with the Government of El Salvador charging that we were interfering in internal matters.

We recognize the sovereignty of El Salvador and do not propose to tell its government how to run its internal affairs. Nonetheless, we have persistently expressed our concerns to the Government of El Salvador about violations of fundamental human rights which we believe transcend geographic and political boundaries. Most recently, we made several demarches concerning the terrorist threat against the Jesuits and actions to protect them. We were concerned by the initial public reticence of the Government of El Salvador after the threat was made. Later, we were pleased to note the protective measures taken by the Government on behalf of the Jesuits and the statements of Salvadoran authorities denouncing all forms of terrorism.

As we promised in the March hearing, we have been assessing our security assistance to El Salvador (as well as arms transfers destined for use by security forces or police) with human rights consideration greatly in mind. The Salvadoran renunciation of future U.S. security assistance applied to fiscal year 1978 and on. Fiscal year 1977 and prior year items are being reviewed on a case-by-case basis. We have declined to provide licenses for the export of some weapons.

We are aware of increased abridgement of internationally recognized human rights in El Salvador from the time of the February election to the assumption of office by President Romero on July 1. We are anxious to work with the Salvadoran government to prevent the trend of an anomalous, unsettled period becoming a continuing part of normal Salvadoran life.

We are prepared to pursue diverse means of stimulating improvement in the human rights situation in El Salvador. We would like to be constructive in our approach. The advent of a new regime in that country may present us with new opportunities for cooperation in dealing with both the immediate, acute problems and the longer range, more endemic conditions. However, we must bear in mind that the complexities of engendering meaningful change in any society are immense. As Deputy Secretary of State Warren Christopher has said, "If we are to do justice to our goals, we must act always with a concern to achieve practical results. * * *"

To assure the cessation of harassment and intimidation of clergymen and other human rights transgressions in El Salvador, it may be fruitful to seek multilateral approaches, for example, through the Inter-American Human Rights Commission. In addition, as you are aware, we are committed to using our voice and vote in the international financial institutions to reflect human rights considerations and we have discussed this policy with the Government of El Salvador.

There will be no diminution of resolve by the U.S. Government in addressing human rights issues with the Government of El Salvador. We would like to have them join in a cooperative pursuit in that regard. Our commitment to fundamental rights of all individuals remains firm. We recognize some of the valid concerns of the Government of El Salvador. We also are keenly aware of the inequities and just grievances which underlie pressures for socio-economic reform in that nation. We are certainly aware of the instances of terrorism which have occurred in El Salvador. Yet we shall always maintain that, in the words of Secretary Vance, "the surest way to defeat terrorism is to promote justice in our

societies—legal, economic and social justice." It is with that premise and moral logic that we wish to conduct our relations with El Salvador and all countries.

I will now try to respond to questions you may have.

Mr. FRASER. Thank you very much, Mr. Secretary.

Let me turn to Mr. Rogers, first, if I may.

Mr. Rogers, you have had the opportunity to contemplate the human rights issue as it has been raised in Congress, and now by the President from the vantage point of both inside the Department and outside.

The Government of El Salvador clearly believes even these hearings constitute a form of improper intervention in their internal affairs, and I would be less than candid if I did not concede that every time we get into a detailed description of the problems of another government I always have the feeling these are their problems primarily, not ours.

What is your view about this matter? How far can we legitimately proceed on this course?

Let me add, what we have used—although it may not register with the listener—what we have used as an underlying rationale is the problems in other societies for them to solve, but the legitimacy of our inquiry stems from our responsibility to fashion and define our relations with another country and to proceed in ignorance or without public discussion of some of the factors that perhaps ought to bear on our relations we would proceed unwisely.

Nonetheless, the sensitivity is strong. It is not unusual now for me to have an ambassador call and indicate if we proceed with the hearings on his country—I am not talking about El Salvador necessarily—that it is likely to adversely affect relations between the United States and the country involved.

The only response I have been able to provide is to agree with the Ambassador that our hearings have yet to improve the relations with any country. I asked an open-ended question. You have had a rather keen interest in the human rights problems for many years, but you have had problems of being in the administration. How do you see the whole problem in terms of U.S. policy?

Mr. ROGERS. Without attempting a definitive answer, Mr. Chairman, perhaps we could open the issue with several points.

This is kind of a series of propositions in inventory form.

One, I have been interested in human rights before, during and after my tour in the U.S. Government. With respect to the function, role, and utility of this subcommittee's inquiries with respect to the human rights issue, I am persuaded that they are useful. I say this for several reasons.

(a) It seems to me quite correct, as you suggest, that it is important for the Congress as a responsible agent of the U.S. Government, playing a creative role in our foreign policy, to be aware of conditions, circumstances and developments, in the nations of Latin America.

This was illustrated for me dramatically during the Alliance for Progress when as you recall our aid program, which was considerably larger than it is now, was explicitly linked to social and economic reform in the hemisphere. It was true then, but it is still true. To the extent we provide support and assistance for economic and social devel-

opment the Congress must know about the rate of social and economic progress in that hemisphere.

Your inquiries illuminate that issue for the Congress.

(b) But the human rights issue in my judgment is even more important than other aspects of your monitoring efforts. Let me see if I can make the point. It seems to me that there may be some argument that the precise form of tax reform, for example, in Paraguay is a national matter for Paraguay.

But the condition of human rights in Paraguay in my judgment is clearly a matter of international concern justifying international inquiry.

The human rights conventions which most nations have signed have committed the signatory nations to abide by what is an international standard.

In other words, the human rights issue is, in my judgment, no longer strictly a national issue.

(c) The third point I would like to make is this: I would think as your committee proceeds it can become clear that you are proceeding not out of a sense of vindictiveness, not in a spirit of denunciation, but rather with an open mind and a remarkable degree of objectivity and fairness.

I am persuaded that it has, quite frankly, Mr. Chairman, been the record of this committee thus far. I think as the international community begins to gather experience with the way this committee and other committees of the Congress will go forward on the human rights issue they will regard this not as an intrusion into their domestic affairs but rather a welcome opening up of an issue which must be of concern to men of good will everywhere.

Mr. FRASER. I put the next question in the context of our hearings. How does the State Department proceed?

Mr. ROGERS. What should the Department do with respect to the human rights issue?

Mr. FRASER. Yes.

Mr. ROGERS. Well, I think it proceeds on three levels, if I can oversimplify the point.

First, clearly, is the public enunciation of the position of the executive branch that human rights behavior is a profoundly important aspect with our relationship with the nations of Latin America.

Public explication of that point, if you will. This has been something I think we made an effort to do during my administration, most remarkably I think with Secretary Kissinger's speech in Santiago, which you will recall I think is fairly characterized as a forthright statement about the human rights condition generally in the hemisphere and specifically in Chile. A strong public level statement in other words.

Second, it seems to me we must have a strong effort to work through the multinational institutions, specifically the Inter-American Human Rights Commission.

As I said, I think the thing that gives our inquiries and concern legitimacy is the fact that human rights is an international legal principle embodied in international conventions.

Therefore, the first line of operational effort ought to be through the international institutions which are there to monitor behavior to determine if it is consistent with the international conventions.

That is why I have always felt it terribly important that we support, strengthen, improve the work of the Inter-American Human Rights Commission, as well as the U.N. Commission.

Third, we do have to fall back on bilateral responses. On a number of occasions, that has to take the form of disassociation, termination of assistance, strong public and private protest, official public and private protest, to the extent the efforts through the international associations do not work. It is a long and difficult and dilemma-vexed problem, as I am sure we all appreciate.

Not the least of the dilemma is the fact we must constantly be aware in this effort that our own record in human rights is not perfection.

Mr. FRASER. That is a nice way of putting it.

Mr. ROGERS. I do not need to press the point. But I recall vividly what this town was like when I came here almost 20 years ago. Blacks could not eat in restaurants. Schools were segregated just across the Potomac in Virginia.

By the same token I think the inquiry into the Salvadoran situation is an inquiry into a specific kind of human rights problem. That is a problem in which possibly private terrorism directed against a religious group who is interested in social and economic reform may have been intertwined with, if you will, official abuse or official toleration.

The kind of phenomenon which has existed in Argentina, constantly raising the question of whether official organs of the government were tolerating, assisting or helping private terrorism. When you get into that kind of case, you immediately raise the problem about the effectiveness of the criminal justice system. Are the security forces of the nation doing their job? The minute we ask that kind of question about another country, we also have to recall that our own criminal justice system is not a model of perfection, that our own efforts to maintain perfect security have not been marked by great success in the last decade.

The problems of security in the United States are very serious. Here again it seems to me we have to proceed with an honest recognition of our own failings in this respect.

Nonetheless, it seems to me we do have to proceed. The issue of human dignity and human rights to me is fundamental to relations between the States and particularly within the Americas. I do think we have to go forward on the various levels I suggest.

Mr. FRASER. Let me comment on two things that are implicit in your statement. One is, I gather you would regard it as fair to attach considerable importance to the question whether or not a country would be prepared to admit an internationally recognized human rights commission, whether it be the Inter-American Commission, perhaps the Red Cross—

Mr. ROGERS. I do, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. FRASER. In other words, if a country refused to let them enter we clearly take that into account in our bilateral relations.

The second thing I gather, about which you have been reasonably explicit, is that you feel our ex-shortcomings should not impose upon us a barrier or restrain against speaking out now about perceived injustices in other places.

Mr. ROGERS. No; I do not think that is a reason for not speaking out. In fact, it seems to me there is a moral consistency between in the actions of those who have struggled for effective implementation of human rights in this country and who also are concerned about people who happen to live in other countries.

I think it is quite consistent. I do not feel that because our own record in human rights has not been perfect—it has been a struggle and continues to be such—is any reason why we need to remain silent on human rights issues abroad.

It seems to me the morality of the issue is universal. It is not cut up by political boundaries.

Mr. FRASER. The last question I have at the moment goes to the fact that in El Salvador, as with many countries, a good deal of a source of difficulty or tension within a society apparently flows from the injustices which are perceived.

I think the Secretary referred to 14 families or concentration of wealth, and I gather land holdings. It may be one thing for us to attempt to encourage the Government of El Salvador to give protection to the Jesuits, but if the underlying difficulty is a much more fundamental structural problem inside the society, our ability to transform that society clearly is either zero or not far from it.

That is the development of a greater degree of special justice has to occur from the inner dynamics of these countries, and even while that struggle goes on because obviously social change of that magnitude is going to create all kinds of tensions, there are going to continue to be human rights problems. It will just naturally flow whether it be violence from the right or the left or whatever. How do we contend with that? In other words, as I read the Declaration of Independence in the United States, if I lived in El Salvador I would be in the hills because the Declaration says under the circumstances prevailed there is a right in effect to overthrow a government.

Yet, obviously we do not believe in violence. How do we deal with this long-term structural problem in the fact it is likely to be the continuing genesis of human rights relations.

Mr. ROGERS. You probably put your finger on the most difficult aspect of managing our foreign relations with the hemisphere.

I have been persuaded, having been in and out of foreign policy apparatus, if you will, dealing with Latin America since 1961, that some of what we thought in 1961 with the Alliance of Progress is still true today.

That is to say, the fundamental need in Latin America is effective development. This means changing social and economic structures. Where that is occurring, it seems to me, in a variety of different ways, there probably is greater respect for human rights. It is occurring, it seems to me, in the democracies—Colombia, Venezuela.

I think you are right, where there is no response to the need of economic reform and change, to the extent that societies are maintained in a rigid status quo fashion, you are going to have more tension and probably more conflict and probably, therefore, more abuse and human rights injustices.

It is a matter of great concern. How we can increase the incentives in countries to forge ahead with social and economic reform I think has been a difficulty and a dilemma that has plagued our foreign relations in the hemisphere ever since we embarked on the Alliance in 1961.

There are no easy answers. It's got to be through a combination of demonstration effects. We have got to use, it seems to me, multilateral institutions, like the World Bank, like the Inter-American Development Bank, the OAS to the extent that it is capable any longer of effectively managing a multilateral consciousness about the need for social and economic change. We also have to do it to the extent we can directly, although we are much less significant as an instructional element, if you will, in Latin America than we were 15 years ago.

I do not have a clear answer to your question. I think the question goes to the very heart of the problem in Latin America.

Mr. FRASER. At the least I gather from what you say, helping countries which are clearly committed to fundamental change would be warranted.

Mr. ROGERS. Absolutely.

Mr. FRASER. We are not in such a situation necessarily to change it all or even to contribute to the willingness to change, but where someone is making the effort, we ought to join in providing sensible assistance.

Mr. ROGERS. And doing a lot of other things too; for example, trade opportunities and that sort of thing. I always felt that we could be even more imaginative, if you will, to give a shorthand expression, figuring out carrots for those who are moving ahead effectively.

That is one of the reasons why I was so deeply concerned, for example, with the exclusion of Venezuela and Ecuador from the generalized system of preferences. I thought those were two countries making efforts in the right direction. It seemed to me lamentable that our policy forced us to take that action which was a setback in our relations with those two countries.

Mr. FRASER. I thought that especially ironic in view of the large number of oil producers in the United States who want to join OPEC.

Mr. Secretary, I don't know if you want to comment on what has transpired. I have some more specific policy questions.

Mr. ARELLANO. I would like to reinforce what Mr. Rogers has said.

I made some points in what positive things we could be doing. I included four, and they parallel very closely. I believe through our aid program we can continue to help in some measure to alleviate social and economic problems that are at the root of many of these inequities that we see.

I would like to see, and I am sure we will, continued Embassy expressions of concern if there appear to be human rights violations. Not only continued but vigorous expressions of concern.

Also, I believe we have various fora, including the International Financial Institutions with our voice and vote policy, where we can make it clear that our assessments of the human rights condition is an important element going into our decisionmaking process; and then finally I believe also we can explore these multilateral approaches such as the Inter-American Human Rights Commission to give a greater degree of moral backing to what we are doing simply because

we have been joined by like-minded people in expressing our concern for these problems.

Mr. FRASER. Let me ask about the application of one of those concepts.

We have, as I understand it, in assisting El Salvador, programs that are related to land reform. I am not at the moment precisely clear about the nature. This would be bilateral economic assistance.

Mr. ARELLANO. Through the aid program?

Mr. FRASER. Through the aid program.

In light of what has transpired there, that is I think your own description was the last President of El Salvador appeared to be genuinely committed to progress on this front but that he got so much pressure from several significant organizations, I gather representing the people already well situated in El Salvador, plus, I understand, the present President in his campaign turned his back on land reform or indicated he would not press forward with it.

In such a situation, where does our AID program stand?

Mr. ARELLANO. I am told by our AID people, and you understand this is not within the Bureau for Inter-American Affairs. We work with them as opposed to—

Mr. FRASER. Let me ask you on that score, is the integrated operation now out for Latin America?

Mr. ARELLANO. No; we still work very closely.

Mr. FRASER. But there was a special—

Mr. ARELLANO. At one time—

Mr. FRASER. There was a special sort of integration area in our State Department operations in Latin America distinct from other continents. Is that no longer true?

Mr. ARELLANO. It is not a formal integration at this point in time. Although it is informal, we still are very close.

I might add, I have fond hope that as time goes on we will be able to maintain this. Abelardo Valdez who has taken the position of Assistant Administrator for Latin America I have known for some time. I hope personalities and friendship can prevail when the bureaucracy tend to get in the way.

Mr. FRASER. In fact, this may pose an interesting question as to how State and AID—

Mr. ARELLANO. I am told by the AID people that they stand prepared at any time to assist. In fact, they made early assistance efforts in the rural transformation program and they are ready to pick up substantial efforts in this direction, again, should the Government of El Salvador request it.

Mr. FRASER. What you are saying though at the moment is we do not have any significant programs in support of such an effort.

Mr. ARELLANO. I would say at the moment we are not spending significant amounts on this. We do have some agricultural credits. We have some credits going to the small farmer during this fiscal year.

In a sense they attack the problem you are talking about. Our AID effort has been channeled toward the poor, toward the rural dispossessed in the agricultural sector.

Mr. FRASER. I take it whatever we are now doing at a modest level, we are satisfied the money spent is producing results notwithstanding the policies of the National Government.

Mr. ARELLANO. Yes. I have visted El Salvador a number of times. It is a country, to be very frank and honest with you, I enjoy. I have seen some of the work that has been going on there particularly by our Peace Corps volunteers, and by the AID people in terms of fisheries production and this I believe is being done through Auburn University.

I believe also there were some Israeli teams in and possibly Canadians. There has been progress in what they would call the sector Agropecuario which is a broader term than merely agriculture.

There have been continuing efforts and they have been very positive efforts. I asked the question in my recent visit there at the Embassy, how our Peace Corps volunteers were doing, whether they were having any problems and the answer I got was "absolutely not." They have been doing very well and they have very stable and working relationship in the countryside.

Mr. FRASER. On pages 2 through 4 of your prepared statement, the reference is made to both rightist and leftist terrorist attacks.

To your knowledge, has the Government prosecuted anyone for these attacks?

Mr. ARELLANO. To my knowledge, they have not. This would include, as you point out both attacks from the right and from the left.

Mr. FRASER. With the number of attacks that have taken place—apparently from both sides of the political spectrum—why wouldn't the Government be able to find somebody who is involved?

Mr. ARELLANO. Mr. Fraser, I think the whole question of terrorism is a terribly complex one. We have not been able to find in this country given the massive resources that we have who set that bomb off. I believe it was at Kennedy.

Mr. FRASER. LaGuardia.

Mr. ARELLANO. And there are other incidences of terrorism where our own internal security forces have not been able to come up with culprits.

I guess if the Government there were predisposed to find somebody and hang him regardless of whether they were guilty or not, they probably could come up with somebody. I take it they have a difficult investigatory condition and they are not able to with justice bring anybody to the bench at this time.

I am convinced from what I have seen that they are making efforts to track down these people. I do not believe living in the condition of terrorism in a society like that is appealing to anybody.

Mr. FRASER. You indicate on page 9 of your statement that President Romero has indicated his intention to pursue economic and social reform.

Is there anything that would elaborate or spell out his intention in that?

Mr. ARELLANO. I can only relate to you what he told me personally. He has been in office 29 days today, at this moment. And he made the comment to me that, "You know, I believe some people are going to be surprised at the measures that my government will take."

The clear implication being because he had been speaking in the context of accusations that had been leveled at him that he was in effect in the pocket, so-to-speak, of the right wing of the country. He rather wryly commented "I think there may be some surprises ahead."

I can only take this to mean he is not against changing some of the needed social-economic conditions. I find it difficult for him to be against this. He is a rational, reasonable man, and certainly he must see the root causes of the problems as well as we do, possibly better.

Mr. FRASER. The El Salvadoran Government renounced the fiscal 1978 military assistance. Does that include the renunciation of military training?

Mr. ARELLANO. Yes. I am told by the Department of Defense, yes, they have renounced both FMS and IMET.

Mr. FRASER. Under those circumstances, do we have a plan to withdraw our military group?

Mr. ARELLANO. The military group actually prior to those circumstances was planned on being phased out. As I understand it, the new operational structure that is going into effect will call for three military officers to be attached directly to the Embassy and under the supervision and purview of the Ambassador, which is probably a healthy arrangement, or healthier arrangement than we now have.

Mr. FRASER. Is that likely to be the pattern in other countries in Latin America, if you know?

Mr. ARELLANO. Yes; my understanding is that it would be.

Mr. FRASER. As I understand it, fiscal year 1977, and prior items are being reviewed on a case-by-case basis. I understand there is no FMS credit agreement which has been signed yet for the current year, fiscal 1977.

Mr. ARELLANO. And there would not be, Mr. Fraser, because they have said they would not take up any of the remaining credits.

Mr. FRASER. They renounced unused credits from fiscal 1977 and prior years?

Mr. ARELLANO. That is right.

Mr. FRASER. Are we granting commercial licenses to sell police equipment and other equipment used for internal security purposes?

Mr. ARELLANO. No; we do have cases under review on a regular basis for commercial sales—sporting goods, sporting type weapons, ammunition for use in hunting with shotguns and things of this sort. That goes on on a regular basis but not by military sales. I do not believe, I might add, we intend to put sporting goods stores out of business down there. I hope we would not want to do that.

Mr. FRASER. We are satisfied that—

Mr. ARELLANO. That is a normal volume of transaction; yes.

Mr. FRASER. I am sure if they want arms there are lots of other places they can get them.

Mr. ARELLANO. As a matter of fact, the Salvadoran Army at least in terms of small arms largely is equipped with European weapons. They are not U.S.-made weapons. The few that are there are used for training purposes and are not regularly used in operations.

Mr. FRASER. You indicated we are committed to using our vote in international institutions which I regard as a very constructive development. Has that been applied to El Salvador?

Mr. ARELLANO. It has. The Salvadoran Government withdrew at least temporarily for consideration of the \$90 million IDB loan for the San Lorenzo Dam project.

Mr. FRASER. Last week at the hearing that we had on El Salvador, former Ambassador Lozano accused the El Salvador Government of

mounting a campaign of harassment and intimidation against Salvadoran priests and expulsion of foreign priests. Is that a fair statement of what the Department believes to have been the case?

Mr. ARELLANO. There is evidence that actions of this type have taken place.

Mr. FRASER. Do we have reason to believe this has changed now?

Mr. ARELLANO. I would hope that given the statements that the President made very recently and of the statements he made to me about his desire for reconciliation and, in fact, the necessity of reconciliation with the church that this would change, yes.

Mr. FRASER. He also said the El Salvadoran Government had tolerated terrorist activities such as those by the White Warriors Union and had chosen not to act against them, what is the Department's view of that?

Mr. ARELLANO. I believe that is a personal opinion of the Ambassador. I have not seen any evidence that would support that view per se. There are conflicting thoughts that come through, even through the intelligence community of what is actually happening.

Mr. FRASER. But what we do know is apparently nobody has been caught yet.

Mr. ARELLANO. Yes, we do.

Mr. FRASER. Ambassador Lozano also indicated he received little or no support of the Department with respect to his actions on human rights. You have not been here very long, so I gather you would not know about this.

Mr. ARELLANO. No, I was sworn in on the 26th of May and reported for duty or work, whatever you want to call it, on the 13th of June.

Mr. FRASER. You are absolved from all prior sins?

Mr. ARELLANO. Not quite, but I do have a statistic there, if you would like to hear that. We did go back and look at the records.

From the period of November of 1976 through July 1977, we have made a total of 15 formal representations to the Salvadoran Government. This does not include the informal representations that I think would number certainly much more than that. Our Defense Attaché, our ARA Central American Desk Director and the Country Officer, the Assistant Secretary and the Deputy Assistant Secretary have made a total of 15 communications to the Government. And this is in direct support of the Embassy.

Mr. FRASER. May I say, my own impression is the administration is doing well on this now. I took his remarks to refer perhaps to some of the earlier months before we were well organized on this issue.

Mr. ARELLANO. I would not want to inject politics into this, but I think we have a new ball game in the United States also as of the 20th of January.

Mr. FRASER. There is a vote on and I know Mr. Smeeton has some questions. We will take a short recess.

[Whereupon, a short recess was taken.]

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Smeeton.

Mr. SMEETON. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Secretary during one of our previous hearings on El Salvador, we heard that there are somewhere in the neighborhood of 200 Catholic priests in El Salvador—I am not sure whether that figure pertained to foreign Catholic priests, or included natives as well. Of

that number roughly 50 were said to be Jesuits. Is that consistent with your own estimate as to the number of priests in El Salvador?

Mr. ARELLANO. Those are the numbers I heard. I heard a slightly larger number on that and slightly smaller number in terms of the number of Jesuits. One of the counts I had was 37. I cannot speak authoritatively.

Mr. SMEETON. The 200 would include native priests as well as foreign priests?

Mr. ARELLANO. Yes.

Mr. SMEETON. Apparently the Jesuits have incurred the wrath of the regime more so than others because they have been more active.

Mr. ARELLANO. I would say the Jesuits have gotten a larger share of the wrath but there are other priests that also have been singled out. The Alas brothers, I am sure you heard their testimony, also have been viewed very critically.

Mr. FRASER. Father Alas is not Jesuit?

Mr. SMEETON. I thought he was a Jesuit.

Mr. ARELLANO. Father Alas, no.

Mr. FRASER. Do you know what order he belongs to?

Mr. ARELLANO. No, I am sorry, I don't know. However, I have known Father Alas for some years.

Mr. SMEETON. He is a diocesan priest?

Mr. ARELLANO. I hear he is a diocesan priest.

Mr. SMEETON. On page 6 of your testimony, you indicated that as far as you can determine, there are more accusations of human rights violations directed at the security police than at the armed forces. Could you give us some idea as to the modus operandi of the internal security apparatus, and whether you have been able to detect any collaboration between the military and the internal security forces? In short, are the internal security forces being asked to carry out the military's unsavory tasks?

Mr. ARELLANO. I am not an authority on this. I can give you some impressions and hope that this will add some light to it. The police and the Guardia National are obviously paramilitary in some sense of the word. Generally speaking throughout Latin America, the military prides itself on professionalism. There is a tendency for the military to maintain a degree of aloofness, saying "we are professionals and do not engage in these repressive things."

Of course, you can find exceptions to that regularly. I might point out in Venezuela—I used to live there during the Perez Jimenez regime—the same situations prevailed there and the police were the oppressive apparatus, the security apparatus of the Government.

Mr. SMEETON. You say that this would be common throughout Latin America?

Mr. ARELLANO. I say it tends that way because the military views itself as a "carrera de armas," a profession of arms and there are certain things that go into that, including by the way our own training which would tend to move people away, I would hope, from notions that they become the repressive elements. I do not think that is the vision that most military people want of themselves in Latin America. Again there are exceptions to that.

Mr. SMEETON. Do you have an estimate as to how many political prisoners are presently being detained?

Mr. ARELLANO. I am sorry, I can't give you that. I don't have that estimate.

Mr. SMEETON. I gather there were quite a few detained shortly after the February elections, but subsequently quite a few were released.

Mr. ARELLANO. After the riots and during the riots there were a considerable number arrested and detained. For the most part they were released after that. There was a large-scale arrest in the country during that period, yes.

Mr. SMEETON. Can you give us any idea what constituted an arrest for a political offense during that period as well as currently?

Mr. ARELLANO. I don't know whether the offense would be political. I think they would classify them as criminal in terms of riots, civil disturbance, disorders in the cities, things of this sort.

Mr. SMEETON. Do they provide these people with counsel or access to counsel?

Mr. ARELLANO. Citizens would not be entitled to access to counsel. Foreigners by convention are entitled, that has been one of the protests we have made. With the American citizens that have been arrested, it has in some cases been laggard, the notification procedure to the Embassy. We need this in order to provide consular services for them. This is one of the points I mentioned to you, we have assurances on. My hope is we do not have too many American citizens arrested.

Mr. SMEETON. I think you mentioned as far as you know there have not been any political prisoners who have been publicly tried.

Mr. ARELLANO. Not to my knowledge.

Mr. SMEETON. Or executed?

Mr. ARELLANO. No, sir, not to my knowledge.

Mr. SMEETON. To what degree presently are Embassy personnel able to maintain contact with the various elements in El Salvadoran society?

Mr. ARELLANO. Would you mind elucidating a bit on what you mean by various elements?

Mr. SMEETON. The various walks of life, for example, the labor and political elements, social, cultural, so on.

Mr. ARELLANO. We maintain agricultural officers, economic counselors, military attachés, cultural officers. I am sure in each of their respective areas they do as much as is possible to have integrated working relationships with the local society. I think the problem in a country like El Salvador is that the fabric of society is really very thin when we get down to it. It is alleged that there is a small, very small, upper class group. You have an incipient middle class and a very, very large lower class group of peasants and poor people, and then you have the church and the military. The church and the military are traditionally two vehicles that become the warp and the woof of society. We do have very good relationships with the military. In fact, this has been one of the criticisms Mr. Fraser has had. This is a function partly of personality. Our military attaché down there is himself a Mexican-American, I believe from New Mexico and has done a very good job of making friendships, of cultivating personal relationships.

I would hope that our Foreign Service people would do as well as he has. He is a model for the kind of thing we would like to have in our Foreign Service in terms of understanding and in terms of the human relationships necessary to have a functioning Embassy.

Mr. SMEETON. Since the February elections, have you noticed any difference in the accessibility of the people our Embassy staff ordinarily interact with in El Salvador?

Mr. ARELLANO. Yes. Just after the elections, there was a distancing of our Embassy from governing circuits. In fact, the terms that were used were *distanciamiento de la embojada*." I think this is a function of the fact that we were making these demarches, we were coming in on a regular basis with letters of protest, demarches to government offices and the reaction again was fairly negative.

I believe this last week gives us indications that we are on an equilibrium point if you want to call it that now where we can have this go one way or the other. My personal view again would be if we have good relationships, and relationships in terms of at least communicating, that this is healthier for us than relationships where channels of communications are clogged or totally shut off.

Mr. SMEETON. It is my understanding that in recent years a new revolutionary group has been emerging in El Salvador. According to my information it is generally referred to as the "Popular Revolutionary Bloc." It is reportedly essentially comprised of peasants but its leadership is said to come from the National Teachers Union. Can you tell us how active this group has been and what threat, if any, it poses to the current regime?

Mr. ARELLANO. Are you referring now to the organizations that have been classified as terrorist organizations or is this a political—

Mr. SMEETON. I gather it is political from the information I have. Its leadership is allegedly drawn from the National Teachers Union generally known by the acronym ANDES.

Mr. ARELLANO. What I would like to do on this is submit it for the record.

[The information follows:]

REVOLUTIONARY POPULAR BLOC

The Bloque Popular Revolucionario (BPR), or Revolutionary Popular Bloc, is an umbrella organization comprised of left-wing opposition groups including workers, peasants (or campesinos), students and teachers. The bloc was reportedly organized by several priests after the killing of some university students during disturbances in July 1975. Groups constituting the BPR include the following:

- The Christian Federation of Salvadoran Peasants (FECCAS).
- The Farm Workers Union (UTC).
- The National Association of Salvadoran Teachers (ANDES-21).
- The 19 July Revolutionary University Students (UR-19).
- The General Association of Salvadoran University Students (AGEUS).
- The Movement of Revolutionary Secondary Students (MERS).

The leadership of the BPR is not known. Although the ANDES-21 is part of the coalition, the peasant groups seem stronger. FECCAS is the strongest and most militant peasant organization in El Salvador.

The leftist terrorist group, the Forces of Popular Liberation (FPL)—the same group which kidnapped and murdered Salvadoran Foreign Minister Mauricio Borgonovo Pohl—is believed to have infiltrated some of the BPR groups. It is known that the FPL has some connections with the Poor People's Guerrilla Army (EGP)—which kidnapped but released the Salvadoran Ambassador to Guatemala at the time of the International Development Bank meeting there in May. The exact nature and strength of those connections are not clear, aside from sharing similar antigovernment attitudes.

Although BPR's activities to date have been of limited significance, their antigovernment actions are of concern to the GOES. Its most serious act involved

members of FECCAS and the UTC, when they seized a municipal building in the town of Quetzaltepeque and destroyed the offices of the government-controlled Cooperative Association (FOCCO) and set free prisoners in the local jail. They were reportedly assisted by members of ANDES-21 and MERS as well as local priests. Most recently, the BPR staged a demonstration on July 30, the anniversary of the 1975 confrontation between security forces and students. The demonstration fell far short of the BPR's expectations, attracting less than 2,000 persons who did some damage to buildings and monuments and marched in downtown San Salvador.

Mr. SMEETON. How would you characterize the status of the revolutionary movement generally? Would you rather supply something for the record on that, too? Maybe you could make that also a part of your response.

Mr. ARELLANO. I think we can make that a part of the answer.

Mr. SMEETON. In that context, is there any indication this element or this group is seeking help and cooperation from similar groups, for example, in Nicaragua, Guatemala? It would be appreciated if we also could have that information.

Mr. ARELLANO. Yes.

Mr. SMEETON. One final question. Today a good percentage of the governments in Latin America are military. Is there anything that makes this particular government unique from the others? Does it consist of a leadership that is embarking on a course that is similar to those pursued by other military governments in Latin America?

Mr. ARELLANO. I don't think there is a consistency in military governments.

Mr. SMEETON. I gather some of these governments have been taking pages from each other's books. For example, in the southern cone, I get that impression. Is there any indication that the current leadership is looking into what is happening down there with the objective of picking up some ideas that could be applied to El Salvador?

Mr. ARELLANO. My personal impression is this is not the case. They do not view the southern cone countries as a model in any sense of the word.

Mr. SMEETON. Not worthy of emulation.

Mr. ARELLANO. I would hope not.

Mr. SMEETON. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Thank you, Mr. Secretary.

Mr. FRASER. Just a few more questions.

There is a reference to riots after the election. My understanding—and this may be erroneous—is that a large number of people gathered to protest what they viewed as electoral fraud. Was there violence prior to the intervention of the security forces or the police?

Mr. ARELLANO. May I check one thing, please, Mr. Fraser.

Mr. FRASER. Sure.

Mr. ARELLANO. If you do not mind my reading some material to you, I think I can answer the question.

Mr. FRASER. That is fine.

Mr. ARELLANO. On the evening of February 21, the day after the election, the opposition party called a mass protest meeting in the main downtown plaza. It attracted some 2,500 to 3,000 participants at its peak. During the morning of February 22, accounts of civil disturbances and worker walk-outs around the country began to spread.

That evening the opposition party held a second rally in the same plaza. It was followed by a march through the downtown section. An estimated 40,000 to 50,000 persons participated. The demonstration was orderly, with no damage beyond graffiti on the walls.

On February 24, a rally of similar magnitude and character took place. At that time the opposition presidential candidate, retired Colonel Claramount, called for annulment of the election, stating his intention to occupy the main plaza until his demand for a new election was met. Simultaneously the Central Election Council announced that it had officially certified the Government party's candidate, Romero, the winner of the election by a 812,000 to 394,000 vote margin.

By Friday morning, February 25, the main plaza had been blocked with small barricades and guarded by youths armed with sticks. Late Friday, the crowd had become an enthusiastic one in excess of 50,000 persons. At 8 o'clock that evening, President Molina addressed the country over nationwide radio-TV, announcing that the elections were officially over, that the losers should return to their jobs and other normal pursuits. He belittled claims of fraud and manipulation.

According to a UPI report, he later stated that "minimal irregularities" might have occurred. However, he added, that where such irregularities might have taken place, they "in no way altered the election results." Around 11 p.m., that evening, an Embassy official visiting the plaza noted some 1,500 persons on hand. Many had bedded down in the plaza and surrounding streets. There were youths manning the barricades. There were reports that heavily armed police and armored cars had been seen in the vicinity.

Mr. FRASER. So there was no rioting.

Mr. ARELLANO. Not up until that point. The riots at the time when there was a very clear movement toward the clearing of the plaza.

Mr. FRASER. By the police forces?

Mr. ARELLANO. Security personnel, armored cars and so on, came in and attempted to disperse the crowd.

Mr. FRASER. I believe Mr. Morales testified—

Mr. ARELLANO. I think the armored personnel carriers they used, I read so much to be honest.

Mr. SMEETON. Some were of European origin?

Mr. ARELLANO. Of German origin, yes.

Mr. FRASER. Just one other question.

Was the Inter-American Bank loan for the water project, hydroelectric?

Mr. ARELLANO. San Lorenzo Dam, hydroelectric, right.

Mr. FRASER. You indicate that had been pulled back.

Mr. ARELLANO. It is in abeyance. We would like to look at that again as time goes on and as we have evidence of what happens with the human rights conditions.

Mr. FRASER. Are there any explicit conditions or understandings that have been developed with relation to the U.S. position on that loan?

Mr. ARELLANO. Our position on the loan will depend on many factors, but very heavily including the weighing of the human rights situation in El Salvador. There are economic factors, of course, that will be weighed.

Mr. FRASER. We do not have an understanding at the moment that the El Salvadoran Government on any one specific item—

Mr. ARELLANO. We are talking in terms of the human rights situation in a very broad way.

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Rogers, we certainly pursued many specific policies. Do you have any closing comments you want to make on what transpired?

Mr. ROGERS. I want you to know, Mr. Chairman, as one who has also sat here while he had operational responsibilities, it is nice to be a has-been. I would like to suggest perhaps you might consider in the interest of a complete record introducing into the record the exchange of letters between Secretary Vance and Father Connor which followed the meeting Father Connor and other priests had with the Secretary about El Salvador: I think the letters do make clear first what I think is fair to characterize as an impressive series of measures taken by the Department in response to the issue at that time.

And then, second, the favorable and thankful reaction of Father Connor to the efforts of the Department, and, finally, his appreciation of the measures that were taken by the new Government of El Salvador with respect to the protection of the Jesuits.

I might add finally that Jesuits here in Washington have been in communication with their brethren in El Salvador as recently as last evening. Evidently the measures for the protection of those Jesuits are continuing, the Jesuits in El Salvador. There has not yet been, therefore, any untoward event, thus far.

I would like to close by saying, as Father Connor pointed out in his letter of July 23 to Secretary Vance, this is the kind of issue which justifies, it seems to me, continued concern. I think it would be appropriate to echo the statements by the witnesses of last Thursday that all of us would like to believe that this committee, among other institutions, would continue its active interest in the situation in El Salvador.

Mr. FRASER. Well, that is our present intention. I hope we are able to stay in touch with events there.

Mr. Arellano, do you have any last comments you want to make?

Mr. ARELLANO. I would like to thank you, Mr. Chairman, for the opportunity to appear before you, and particularly for the fact you did not burn me at the stake here today.

Mr. FRASER. Well, it is hard to do with somebody who has come in new.

Mr. ROGERS. Wait until you have been around for a year.

Mr. FRASER. My thanks to both of you. This has been a very interesting and informative session.

We appreciate the time you have given us.

The subcommittee stands adjourned.

[Whereupon, at 11:56 a.m., the subcommittee adjourned.]

APPENDIX 1

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS FOR THE RECORD

STATEMENT OF JOHN J. MCAWARD, ASSOCIATE DIRECTOR, INTERNATIONAL PROGRAMS, UNITARIAN UNIVERSALIST SERVICE COMMITTEE

The Unitarian Universalist Service Committee is a Boston-based international organization, non-sectarian by charter, which provides funding and consultation for nationals in the developing countries of Latin America and Sub-Saharan Africa in order to enable them to carry out programs of social change. It receives all of its support from individual donors and foundations and receives no funds from the U.S. government. Current program commitments are in integrated family planning in Haiti, including the delivery of health care services and the development of agricultural cooperatives; an agricultural development project in Peru; a literacy experiment in Tanzania; and leadership training and empowerment in Guatemala and El Salvador. We maintain no expatriate staff overseas.

In connection with our program in El Salvador which has been carried out with the cooperation of the Archdiocese of San Salvador, I have had the opportunity to visit that country many times over the last five years. During this period I have been made very much aware of the climate of oppression and repression and the suffering that the majority of Salvadorans must endure under their present and past military governments. I have spoken with the survivors of the attack on unarmed campesinos in La Gayetana in November of 1974. I have spoken with families whose sons and daughters disappeared following the military attack on the unarmed students in the capital on July 30, 1975. I have been aware both through reading of the Salvadoran newspapers and talking with campesinos and Catholic priests throughout the country of the many others who have disappeared often after being arrested.

In the events leading up to the February 20 presidential elections in El Salvador, I became cognizant of the increase of repression, the disappearances and the use of torture and arbitrary arrest. After receiving reports of the widespread electoral fraud on February 20 and the subsequent events leading to the February 28th massacres, the Unitarian Universalist Service Committee Board of Directors instructed me to make a preliminary exploratory visit to El Salvador in order to discuss first-hand with our project director how best to assist the Salvadorans in this difficult hour. After a short visit of four days it was decided that the most effective way of aiding the Salvadorans would be to return and do a full-scale investigation of the abuses of human rights and to publicize the results of our investigation in the U.S.

On April 30, 1977, Richard Scobie, the Executive Director of the Unitarian Universalist Service Committee, and I travelled to El Salvador. Scobie returned to the U.S. on May 13 while I remained until May 21. This testimony summarizes our findings to date.

In seeking eyewitnesses, we tried to confirm each account with separate and independent testimony. We concentrated on six areas:

- 1) killings of unarmed civilians in and around the Plaza Libertad from 1:00 a.m. on February 28 until the evacuation of the Plaza in the early morning.
- 2) killings of unarmed civilians with heavy caliber automatic weapons and small arms after 9:00 a.m. the morning of February 28 throughout central San Salvador.
- 3) evidence of arbitrary arrests, holding of persons incomunicado without charge, torture and assassination while in official custody.
- 4) electoral fraud.
- 5) evidence of continued violence in and around the capital.
- 6) persecution of the Church (because of its support of human rights and the work of a small number of progressive young priests. While we were in San Salvador one was assassinated at 6:00 p.m. in his home one block from our hotel).

There follows, in greater detail, some of our findings to date.

- 1) Killings of unarmed civilians in and around the Plaza Libertad¹

In the wake of widespread fraud that nullified the apparent victory of the UNO candidate, Claramount, the party leaders and thousands of their followers occupied the Plaza Libertad on Monday, February 21. The occupation continued through Sunday, February 27, with continual meetings and rallies with the exception of Wednesday which was a rest day. The crowd was unarmed with UNO marshals insuring that no demonstrators brought in weapons. The atmosphere was described as characterized by enthusiasm, exasperation (at the electoral results), and festivity with much music, singing, entertainment, etc. Whole families, small children, food vendors, etc. milled around in numbers that on some days reached 60,000. As the confrontation with the authorities approached, it was the understanding of the rally leaders (from the head of the National Police) that only fire hoses and tear gas would be used, and these only if necessary.

¹We have taped interviews with groups of persons who were eyewitnesses to #1, #2, and #5.

At about 1:00 a.m. on the 28th the combined security forces (including the Army, National Guard, Aduana Police, Hacienda Police and Immigration Police) sealed off all of the exits to the Plaza except one (Second Street). With the beginning of the use of fire hoses those in the Plaza concentrated themselves around the large Libertad monument. Some began to sing the national hymn. Suddenly soldiers began to fire, cutting down two young men near the monument. In the ensuing panic at least 1500 jammed into the El Rosario Church while 500 or 600 rushed down Second Street to escape. This route served as a type of gauntlet that channeled the demonstrators more than ten blocks to a traffic circle known as the Reloj de Flores. Troops and police in all of the side streets beat the demonstrators with clubs and machetes as they ran by.

At the Reloj many of those in the first group were allowed to flee. According to one witness, a lawyer, the rest were herded below the railroad terminal to a spot where natural walls on either side of the highway enabled the security forces to corral the group. When one asked, "Are you going to kill us now?", they said, "Five at a time, we'll kill you." From the mass of over 600 people, the soldiers separated out groups of five and forced them to run a gauntlet composed of about forty soldiers on each side. Everyone who ran through was hit with rifle butts, kicked and given machete blows mostly with the flat edge of the machete. After about a hundred people had thus passed through the gauntlet, they were released to flee back up the road towards the Reloj de Flores. Many shots were heard from that direction, including machine gun or automatic weapon fire. The lawyer later stated that after being arrested and beaten, he was taken by car to the headquarters of the Hacienda Police. On the way he saw many bodies on the side of the road. At one point they passed three teenagers who were walking on the side of the road. The Hacienda Policeman who was travelling in the car with him pulled out his pistol and shot all three of them at almost point-blank range.

Those still in the church were then subjected to tear gas attacks which inspired several waves of demonstrators to attempt to escape. The second group, estimated at over 500, were run to the Reloj where they were taken in large open trucks to the National Guard headquarters and imprisoned there. The third group was driven beyond the clock to the railroad terminal where in a scene of great confusion they were released in groups of five, only to be shot down by other troops farther up the road. We have two eyewitnesses who saw at least 15 persons shot in this manner. One second hand informant claims a relative working at Rosales Hospital counted over 100 dead and many wounded brought in before dawn.

The remaining demonstrators were evacuated by the Red Cross after 4:00 a.m. One of these persons reports seeing the bodies of several children covered with blood being thrown down the corner storm sewer. ("I couldn't believe what I was seeing.") After the Plaza was cleared, the fire hydrants were opened and the clean-up began. Another person who stayed in the church reported that at least one infant suffocated in the tear gas attack. He offered the mother a wet handkerchief to cover the child's face and she said, "What for? the child is already dead." This woman, like about 20% of the crowd who had been attracted by the carnival atmosphere of the demonstration, had been near the door of the church selling food.

2) Killings in the center-city later in the morning of the 28th

After the clearing of the Plaza, a cordon of military personnel was put around several blocks -- extending to the President's headquarters. In radio broadcasts, the government had told the citizenry that everything was quiet in the city and that people should return to work and school as usual. Thus by 9:00 a.m. there was a large number of office workers, shopkeepers, shoppers and high school students mingling with demonstrators. According to eyewitnesses, it was the high school students who began to roam through the downtown area. They focused their anger on one of the leading newspapers, La Prensa Grafica, which only publishes the government line and refuses in their news stories to cover the events truthfully. It has also refused to accept even paid advertisements that might give a different view of the events. Security forces fired on the demonstrators at point-blank range with heavy calibre machine guns. We talked with an office worker who from the top floor of her building observed several men shot down. A young American couple was almost shot while shopping for bread four blocks from the cordon area. Three persons were shot in the street within five yards of them. Five Americans saw a government truck with ten to fifteen bodies pass under their apartment balcony on Ninth Street. Other eyewitnesses reported seeing three large Army trucks with an estimated 40-50 bodies each leaving the downtown area. THE OFFICIAL GOVERNMENT ADMISSION WAS THAT FOUR PERSONS WERE KILLED BETWEEN 1 A.M. AND 2 P.M. ON FEBRUARY 28. THIS WAS LATER ADJUSTED TO FIVE WHEN A REPORTER AT A PRESS CONFERENCE INDICATED THAT HE ALONE HAD PICTURES OF FIVE SEPARATE BODIES.

OUR CONSERVATE ESTIMATES PLACE THE NUMBER IN EXCESS OF TWO HUNDRED DURING THE EVENTS OF FEBRUARY 28.

3) Arbitrary arrest and holding of persons incommunicado without charges seems widespread

We spoke with many individuals who were detained without charge, interrogated, and severely beaten. Several were tortured with electric shock. One was kept in a ten-foot deep drainless concrete well, beaten, threatened with death, only to be released after one week upon inquiries from a friend in the military. Last year a black-American citizen, Ronald James Richardson, was apparently assassinated while being detained by the Salvadoran government for misdemeanors. Former Ambassador Lozano made this case the focus of his attention in U.S./Salvadoran relations and encouraged by President Carter's position on the human rights issue, distinguished himself in pursuing this case forcefully.

Our findings in this area directly contradict the State Department's report found in Volume 2 of the 1977 Congressional Presentation Document which on page 122 states that "the Salvadoran government does not condone nor is there evidence of a pattern of torture, inhumane or degrading treatment or punishment." We know of no political prisoners who were not tortured, treated inhumanely or in a degrading way. Arbitrary arrest is common with many prisoners disappearing and presumed dead.

It would appear that the State Department in next year's presentation will have to reassess its observation that El Salvador detains only a "handful" of political prisoners and begin to include in their assessment the witnessed arrests of people who later have disappeared.

4) Evidence of electoral fraud is widespread.

Even in the campesino organization thought to be most friendly to the government, one of the directors reports that he knows of no member who voted for the government slate. In the municipality of Suchitoto, people willing to vote for the PCN (government slate) were given more than one ballot. Even the mayor, who voted first, put in two ballots. Although Salvadoran law calls for opposition poll watchers to be present at all of the voting stations, UNO watchers were systematically harassed and threatened. One party official was beaten. The harassment was so bad that the local UNO chief pulled his watchers out at 9:00 a.m. By 11:00 a.m., with 50% of the voters not having cast their ballots, they were told that all of the votes had been cast. The UNO representatives to the Municipal Election Commission filed ten separate complaints and was refused a receipt for any of them. We have photocopies of dozens of signed depositions describing electoral fraud throughout the country.

The apparent reason why the opposition party was able to demonstrate so strongly against the government was because the fraud reached into every voting area and was obvious to all who voted. There was hardly a person who did not relate a personal story regarding the vote fraud. Votes were cast for the dead, and those from the ruling party voted time and time again. One official told us that they were unable to get any transportation at the Ministry of Health for several days prior to the election because the cars had been commandeered by the party to transport their voters to the polls. We have obtained tape recordings of short wave messages being transmitted by government support units to all parts of the country giving instructions in transparent code to stuff the ballot boxes.

5) Evidence of continued violence

A taxi driver reported that on May 11th, two days after the Foreign Minister's body was discovered, he came upon four youths who had been shot on a coastal road. The National Guard was standing over the bodies, motioning people on. On Friday morning, May 13th, a doctor reported seeing the bodies of three campesinos in the National Morgue who had been shot through the back. Later that morning the police prevented an autopsy and took the bodies away in a military ambulance to an undetermined destination. On Friday, May 13th, a young man of 23 years witnessed a pickup truck being driven by a policeman with two men in the front with shovels. In the back were two other policemen guarding the cadavers of five young people, shirtless, all of whom were shot. Blood was dripping from the rear of the pickup, which was then only three blocks from the cemetery of the poor, La Vermeja.

There was no mention in any of the Salvadoran papers or over the radio of these deaths. There was no explanation given or deemed necessary. If I, in the space of a week, was able to speak with three people who witnessed the unreported deaths of 12 Salvadorans, it would appear that the wave of terror continues to grip El Salvador and that the abuse of human rights is widespread.

6) Persecution of the Church and terrorism in the country-side are escalating

The major attack on the part of the government, however, appears to be directed at the Catholic Church. From our perspective, the Church appears to be the only viable institution that sees the need for deep social and economic change and has the capability to extend into each municipality in order to influence the direction

of that change. We have observed in the Catholic Church in El Salvador an evolutionary development begun during the time of Pope John XXIII and accelerated after the Medellin Conference in 1968 which has resulted in a gradual shift in focus away from dogma and doctrine to an application of the social justice philosophies contained in the Gospels. Men and women of incredible courage have already given their lives in this struggle. The young clergy and the laity have managed to influence the hierarchy, to the extent that there now appears to be growing agreement regarding the mission of the Catholic Church in El Salvador. In May, all of the Bishops in El Salvador issued a manifesto which condemned "atheistic Communism for negating God and all spiritual values, for exploiting the class struggle, and for using man as a tool for political power", and at the same time "with the same vigor . . ." condemned "liberal capitalism which, while professing a belief in God, in practice negates Him and places all faith in profit, making man a tool for acquiring more wealth".²

Other witnesses who will appear at this hearing can speak more directly of the events after May 21 as they have affected the Catholic Church in El Salvador. However, we would like to share some of the information which we gathered while in El Salvador as it relates directly to the Catholic Church.

To date two priests have been assassinated, Rutilio Grande on March 12, 1977, and Alfonso Navarro on May 11, 1977.

Father Grande was as unlikely a candidate for assassination as there can be. Born poor in the village of El Paisnal, he studied for the priesthood, became a Jesuit and then was the Prefect of Studies in both the Jesuit Central American Seminary in San Salvador and the Prefect of Studies at one of the leading Catholic high schools in El Salvador where the sons of the rich are educated. He asked to be assigned to a parish where he could be in closer contact with the poor and thus returned to work in and around the town of his birth. From all that we could determine, he was never involved in politics. Yet he was brutally murdered with two parishioners who were riding with him. In the report prepared by the diocesan lawyer, Dr. Fernando Augusto Mendez, for Archbishop Oscar Romero, completed on April 26, the following is learned: many witnesses have identified a man by the name of Benito Estrada as the man who fingered Rutilio Grande and signalled to his killers who then followed Father Grande in their vehicles as he was leaving the town of Aguilares. Despite an order issued by the judge in Quezaltepeque for the detention of Benito Estrada, to this day this man walks freely in Aguilares. The conclusion of the study indicates a

² "Message From the Episcopal Conference of El Salvador" May 16, 1977

government failure to properly investigate the killing. There has been little or no effort to identify witnesses and, more than two months after the death, exhumation of the body in order to make more definite findings regarding the type of weapons that were used in the killings has been denied.

Father Navarro was killed on May 11, the same day the body of Foreign Minister Borgenovo was discovered. The case of Father Navarro had its antecedents. In January 1977 his house was firebombed during the night. The neighborhood watchman who travels around the area on bike was removed by the police the evening before the firebombing and assigned a different area with a new watchman assigned to the area which included Navarro's house. After the firebombing an official government vehicle, a white Hornet with license plate number N-5917, was continually parked diagonally across from Navarro's house with two government agents in it at all times. In the late afternoon of May 11, just prior to Father Navarro's assassination, the white Hornet left the scene.

Shortly thereafter four men, their faces partially masked, knocked on the door of the rectory. The door was opened by a fourteen year old youngster, Luis Torres, who had come to the rectory to say goodbye to his friend Father Navarro prior to leaving the following day for the United States to be with his mother. One masked man put a gun to young Torres' head, forced him to lie on the ground inside the house, face down. The other three went to the kitchen, grabbed the cook, and threatened her with death unless she told them where the priest was. One stayed with the cook while the other two searched the house and found Father Navarro on the patio. They put him up against the wall and began to shoot him at point-blank range with weapons that are available only to the security forces in El Salvador. Upon hearing the shots on the patio the accomplice, who was guarding the cook ran from the kitchen, joined his two companions and fled on foot. As the fourth man was leaving the house, he put a bullet in the back of the fourteen year-old's head despite the fact that this youngster could not have identified any of the assassins. The four men calmly walked away from the scene and were picked up by a vehicle around the corner.

Again, the government has indicated its lack of interest in the case by failing to investigate the matter. Evidence of this failure can be seen in the fact that two bullet casings were found on the floor of Father Navarro's house six hours after the shooting. These were not hidden casings but rather they were found in full view on the floor in the blood of the victims.

While no specific group has claimed responsibility for the death of Father Grande, the right wing White Warrior Union has taken the credit for Father Navarro's death.

Father Navarro, while mortally wounded, told those around him that he forgave his killers. He had been expecting death for some time particularly since the head of the National Guard Col. Alvarenga had told the Archbishop that he "did not like the way Father Navarro preached." It is assumed that he was referring to the sermon Father Navarro delivered on the Plaza Libertad on Sunday evening, February 27, just prior to the government attack.

A priest from the parish in Tecoluca, Father Rafael Barahona, whom I have met many times, described to me his torture while in the custody of Salvadoran police officials on February 21 and 22. He was handcuffed, placed face down and received numerous kicks to the head, side and legs from noon until 10 P.M. At 10 P.M. he was stripped and placed on an iron cot. For nine hours electric shocks were applied to his feet and his hands as he was doused with ice water. From 7 A.M. the next morning until 2 P.M. he remained handcuffed hand and foot to the iron cot and every fifteen minutes received from his captors two blows to the chest with a wooden club. Father Rafael Barahona suffered a serious brain concussion and spent almost three months recuperating. This is the same Father Barahona who, on March 11, left his Church in Tecoluca early in the morning in his Volkswagen car. In the afternoon, his brother Manuel drove Rafael's car back to Tecoluca where, being mistaken for Rafael, he was ambushed and murdered.

I spoke to another man whose name I am not at liberty to mention but who has promised that he would testify again if a Congressperson would accompany the Service Committee to El Salvador to do a further investigation. He is a catechist in his local church, a farmer who in 1972 served as a poll watcher for the opposition party. However, he lost confidence in the political process at that time when massive vote fraud denied the winner the Presidency.

On March 7 at 2 A.M. six National Guardsmen arrived at his house to arrest him on charges of leading a bus strike on February 25. He was bound and three of the guards took him away to the local Guard headquarters an hour away. (The three that remained struck his wife five times with the flat edge of their machetes.) Four and a half hours later, dressed as a guard, he was taken blindfolded to the National Guard headquarters in San Salvador. When he arrived, a team of six civilians tortured him for 20 minutes, kneeing him to the body, punching him all over. He was given electric shock to the inside of the nose and to the testicles. The force was so great that each time he was given a shock his entire body was lifted off the chair and he was thrown to the ground. In addition, a plastic bag was tied over his head many

times and was not released until he went unconscious. Finally, he was given a karate chop to the neck which caused him to lose consciousness. He awakened lying face down, handcuffed from behind, with a chain tied from the cuffs to a 50-pound weight which was placed on his legs.

From Monday until Friday he was given no food. The water that he was offered and refused was mixed with urine. He was given no opportunity to tend to any of his personal needs during this time. Through sheer willpower he forced himself to control all bodily functions to such an extent that after he was transferred the following Saturday to the national police headquarters and was given a small amount of food and a small amount of liquid, he was still unable to void for another four days. On March 14, one week later, he was sentenced to 30 days in jail and was released on April 30. His wife, who had placed photographs in the paper reporting him missing, was not notified.

Another friend, Juan Francisco Romero, from the same community as Father Barahona and a catechist in his church, was arrested on Sunday, May 15 at 5 A.M. by uniformed agents of the National Guard. He was last seen being taken in a car enroute to San Salvador where it was assumed he was placed in the same National Guard facility where the previous victim cited was tortured, and treated in the same manner. I have had no news about this friend. But again, his only crime seems to be associating with Catholic priests. He has not been charged with any crime nor has his arrest been recognized by the government.

I could share with this Committee many more instances of brutal torture at the hands of the security forces of the Salvadoran government. The attacks on the laity and clergy continue unabated. Since the first of the year there have been seven priests, two of them nationalized Salvadorans who have been refused reentry into the country despite having valid visas. There have been eight Catholic priests expelled from the country and two Catholic priests assassinated with four additional victims dying as a result of these assassinations if we include the brother of Rafael Barahona. In addition, two priest-brothers, Inocencio and Higinio Alas were forced to leave the country after living for months under threats of death. There are many priests and catechists who have been tortured, have disappeared, or are presently in hiding after receiving threats. The Auxiliary Bishop of the Archdiocese of San Salvador, Monsignor Rivera Y Damas, as well as the Superior General of the Jesuits in Central America, Cesar Jeres, have been threatened with death. At the time that I left the country, they were sleeping in different houses each evening to avoid a planned attack.

Meanwhile, in the government-censored press and radio the enemies of the Catholic Church are allowed to print what they will against the Church while the defenders of the Catholic Church are often denied access to these media. The government has created at least three phantom Catholic groups, heretofore unknown to the Archdiocese, which have been given frequent access to publish their manifestos in the newspapers. The Society for Christian Women, the Association for Religious Catholic Women, and the Association of the Followers of Christ the King, are among the groups that have been created without apparent leadership to defend the government and attack the Church. An association of wealthy landowners (FARO) and the association of wealth industrialists (ANEP) publish their manifestos frequently. The only way the Church can respond is through their radio station and the weekly diocesan newspaper, both of which have been threatened with being closed down by the government.

In addition, there is a small mimeographed newspaper called "Justice and Peace" which has attracted a small but committed readership among the campesinos and poor urban dwellers which provides the poor with some access to the truth. However, with a circulation of only 8,000 in a country of 4.5 million its influence is minimal. The government for the last four years has made strenuous efforts to have the Archdiocese take away publication permission for this newspaper but Archbishop Gonzales Y Chaves, now retired, and the current Archbishop, Oscar Romero, thus far have defended this tiny voice in support of the poor. To avoid any charge of subversion, the editor sends to the Presidential Palace the first two copies of each issue.

During our visit we met several times with Ambassador Lozano and the political officer, William Walker. Neither were surprised by our findings and indicated that we confirmed, albeit in greater detail, information that they had been receiving as well. They encouraged us to continue and were extremely helpful in providing a historical and cultural perspective that enabled us to develop a deeper understanding of the Salvadoran scene.

In view of the current realities of El Salvador, it is disturbing to realize the extent to which the U.S. government policies and private economic activities serve to encourage and strengthen this repressive Salvadoran region. Despite official assertions that El Salvador has no strategic value to the United States we continue to provide specialized training to Salvadoran military personnel. In addition to the regular attache, we maintain a complement of ten military officers in our Embassy to provide additional support and liaison to the Salvadoran military. Many millions of dollars

in OPIC guarantees encourage private investors to support the local economy in ways which tend to strengthen the ruling class. We continue to sell arms for use by the very military units that are carrying out the repression. (This will continue despite the recent rejection of our military loan and grant program). Our support for loans to El Salvador from the World Bank and the Inter-American Development Bank, along with loan guarantees from the Export-Import Bank all serve to reinforce and strengthen the position of a government that has shown that it does not deserve our support.

I am grateful for the invitation to submit this testimony. I do so on behalf of the Unitarian Universalist Service Committee in order to fulfill our pledge to our Salvadoran friends that I would bring the conditions in their nation to the attention of the people of the United States; and in the hope that Congress will develop legislation that will limit the extent to which the Administration, agencies of government, and international lending agencies can give support to repressive regimes such as El Salvador. The people of the United States pay for this support but if they had seen what I have seen in El Salvador, they would not condone it.

STATEMENT OF THOMAS J. LIGGETT, PRESIDENT OF CHRISTIAN THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY, INDIANAPOLIS, IND.

My name is Thomas J. Liggett. I am the president of Christian Theological Seminary in Indianapolis, Indiana. In the course of my professional career I have lived in Latin America for 20 years, serving primarily as a parish minister, professor, and seminary president in Argentina and Puerto Rico. For 3 years, I was chairman of the Latin America Department of the National Council of Churches. In 1972, I was co-chairman of the task force on Latin American Policy for the McGovern campaign. Since returning to live and work in the United States in 1965 I have maintained close contact with Latin American affairs, published a book on Latin America in 1970 and have traveled regularly to Latin America.

In mid-June 1977, I made a brief visit to El Salvador as a member of a small committee which was sent to that country by the World Council of Churches and the National Council of Churches in the U.S.A. The purpose of that visit was to establish direct contact with church leaders in El Salvador, to express to these leaders the concern of the two councils for the escalated violence in El Salvador and to ascertain the ways in which the Councils might be helpful in being supportive of the church in El Salvador and in the restoration of a climate of justice, peace and the respect for basic human rights.

In the course of this visit, extensive contacts were made with leaders of Roman Catholic and Protestant Churches, as well as with officials of the Embassy of the United States of America. In the course of these contacts, it was clearly established that:

1. Large numbers of persons have been victimized, and many killed, during the violence in El Salvador—especially in the first six months of 1977.

2. Many priests of the Roman Catholic Church have been arrested by police, several have reported that they were tortured and/or mistreated by the police. Many priests have been expelled from the country. Two priests have been killed.

3. The archbishop of San Salvador, the very Rev. Oscar A. Romero, has repeatedly taken public positions in support of his priests. He has declared that he will not take part in any official or governmental ceremony until the persecution of the church and its clergy is terminated. The archdiocese of San Salvador has organized an emergency council which has been meeting three times each week to deal with the issues raised by this crisis.

4. The church-sponsored weekly publication Orientacion has valiantly published information about the series of violent attacks on the church and its leaders—with the result that its printing presses have been bombed twice in May and June. On the day of our arrival, an armed man forced his way into the office of the editor, Father Torruella, but did not succeed in harming the editor.

5. I had personal conversations with priests who have fled their parish houses and are living in the building that serves as the archdiocesan office—not daring to go out on the streets of the city for fear of their lives. The climate of fear and intimidation is very much in evidence in El Salvador.

6. The position of the United States' ambassador, Mr. Ignacio Lozano (since resigned) has demonstrated the concern of the United States in all matters of basic human rights. He has pressed (without success) for a clarification from the government of El Salvador for an explanation of the disappearance (and possibly murder) of a U.S. citizen, Mr. Ronald J. Richardson. The ambassador also attended the public funeral for the second priest who was killed, Father Navarro.

7. Steps have been taken by protestant leaders in El Salvador to express their deep concern for the Roman Catholic Church and to seek ways to alleviate the present state of tension and violence.

8. The attempt of the government of El Salvador to interpret the recent problems as the result of a very few activist priests is a clear distortion of the actual situation. The impact of Vatican Council II and the declaration of the Catholic

Bishops in Medellin in 1968 have resulted in new vigor and relevance among the leaders of the Roman Catholic Church in Latin America. In the case of El Salvador, the hierarchy, under the leadership of Archbishop Romero, has emphatically defended the actions of the priests, the legitimacy of their concern for human dignity, justice and peace; and has resisted all pressures which have been brought to bear upon them by the government and its related organizations (FARO and pseudo-catholic organizations critical of the new stance of the church).

For 6 months, a succession of news reports has emerged from El Salvador which pointed to the systematic violation of human rights and to the persecution of the Roman Catholic Church. My visit in June 1977 confirmed to my complete satisfaction that these violations and this persecution are factual. On the basis of this confirmation, I have reported to the National Council of Churches in the U.S.A. and to the World Council of Churches that a crisis situation does, in fact, exist in El Salvador and advised these Councils to take all appropriate steps to be supportive of the Christian leadership in that country and to exercise the considerable influence of these Councils on national governments and international organizations to adopt all possible measures which give promise of the restoration of peace, justice and the respect for human rights in El Salvador.

APPENDIX 2

STATEMENT BY ARCHBISHOP JOSEPH L. BERNARDIN, PRESIDENT OF THE NATIONAL CONFERENCE OF CATHOLIC BISHOPS, MADE ON JULY 6, 1977 DEPLORING THE PERSECUTION OF THE CATHOLIC CHURCH IN EL SALVADOR

It is now nine years since the bishops of Latin America ratified the Church's evangelical commitment to the poor and oppressed of their continent in the historic meeting of Medellin. The life of the Church in Latin America since that time has illustrated, more dramatically than any documents could, the meaning of this commitment in the daily struggle of the Christian people.

Each year has witnessed new chapters in the fidelity of the Church in Latin America to the gospel's imperative of love, service, and liberation.

The Medellin conference was hardly over and its proposals had barely begun to be implemented, when one of the smallest of the hemisphere's republics, El Salvador, engaged in a tragic war with its neighbor, Honduras. The root causes of that conflict—landlessness, high unemployment, and the failure of national plans to redress these great inequities—persist to this day in both countries.

Just two years ago, peasant groups in Honduras and the Church's pastoral agents working with them attempted to petition their government to implement the already passed land reform act. Their non-violent demonstrations were met with massive repression, resulting in the deaths of several people, including an American priest, Father Casimir Cypher, O.F.M. Conv. In the name of our bishops' conference I addressed that issue in a statement on human rights in Honduras in September, 1975.

In El Salvador today the situation is even more dramatic. The lines have been drawn sharply between, on the one hand, the landless peasants and the ministers of the Church at every level—from bishops to local lay catechists (Delegates of the Word of God)—and, on the other, the national security forces and the landed oligarchy.

The past year has been a time of intense conflict, reaching peaks of bloody violence in February of this year after the national elections and again in May.

Throughout this entire period another form of violence and repression, less bloody but no less vicious, has been carried on though the press in the form of a campaign of slander and calumny against the Church, and through government agencies in the form of arrests, expulsions, or exiling of Salvadoran and foreign priests.

The position of the Church has been eminently clear. In numerous statements from the episcopal conference and from the Archbishop of San Salvador, in meetings with the governmental authorities, in public services in the cathedral and elsewhere, the Church has sought tirelessly to foster a climate of peace and reconciliation in which violence and hatred could be overcome.

But at the same time the Church has remained absolutely steadfast in its collective determination to preach the gospel in all its integrity to all the people. The Church's essential and inescapable mission, that of evangelization, involves "the duty of proclaiming the liberation of millions of human beings, many of whom are her own children—the duty of assisting the birth of this liberation, of giving witness to it, of ensuring that it is complete." (Pope Paul VI, *Evangelii Nuntiandi*, 30)

None of this, as Pope Paul has insisted, is foreign to the mission of the Church. "Evangelization would not be complete if it did not take account of the unceasing interplay of the Gospel and man's concrete life, both personal and social. This is why evangelization involves an explicit message, adapted to the different situations constantly being realized, about the rights and duties of every human being, about family life without which personal growth and development is hardly possible, about life in society, about international life, peace, justice and development—a message especially energetic today about liberation." (*Evangelii Nuntiandi*, 29)

In few other countries today has the Church's pastoral ministry been met with such intense and organized opposition as in El Salvador. The tiny minority of rich and powerful, zealous guardians of a sterile and unjust status quo, have not hesitated to employ every means at their disposal to obstruct the preaching of the gospel. Fifteen foreign priests, three of them from the United States, have been expelled; several Salvadoran priests and catechists have been arrested, two have been forced into exile, and others are prohibited from returning to their parishes. And two Salvadoran priests, Father Rutilio Grande, S.J., and Father Alfonso Navarro, have been brutally assassinated.

I am confident that the sufferings of the Salvadoran Church will hasten the coming of the kingdom of justice and peace that has been promised by the Lord. I send this expression of fraternal solidarity to our brother bishops of El Salvador, to all the clergy and religious, especially the members of the Society of Jesus who have been singled out for special persecution, and to the whole People of God in El Salvador who struggle and suffer for justice, reconciliation, and peace.

APPENDIX 3

MATERIAL SUBMITTED BY FATHER RICHARD

TRANSLATION OF THE WARNING RECEIVED FROM THE WHITE WARRIOR UNION ORDERING JESUIT PRIESTS TO LEAVE EL SALVADOR BY JULY 20, 1977

WAR ORDER NO. 6

The Supreme Command of the White Warrior Union (Union Guerrera Blanca—U.G.B.) in the face of the criminal persistence of those groups that through the bloodying of our fatherland plan to enslave it to international Communism orders:

(1) All Jesuits without exception must leave the country forever within 30 days of this date. These miserable supporters of the murderous Popular Forces of Liberation have no reason to continue poisoning our people.

(2) The religious orders and priests who are not agents of international Communism have nothing to fear from us and can continue their work in complete tranquility. Our struggle is not against the Church but against Jesuit guerillaism (el guerillerismo jesuitico).

(3) If our order is not obeyed within the indicated time, the immediate and systematic execution of all jesuits who remain in the country will proceed until we have finished with all of them. Further: We warn (A) all neighbors, (B) parents and students, (C) employees that if as of the indicated date there is disobedience, all Jesuit installations and places frequented by them will be considered military targets. Since this warning has been made with sufficient anticipation, we will not be responsible for the death of third persons as a consequence of our operations.

(4) According to the circumstances, the U.G.B. reserves the initiative to effect operations before the deadline.

LONG LIVE THE COMMANDOS OF LIBERTY!

WAR TO THE DEATH WITH INTERNATIONAL COMMUNISM!

THE FATHERLAND TO POWER!

WHITE WARRIOR UNION

W. W. U.

—San Salvador June 21, 1977.

The deadline is July 20, 1977.

FACT SHEET ON EL SALVADOR WITH REFERENCE TO ATTACKS ON THE CHURCH AND JESUITS

An urgent fact.—As reported in the Washington Post (AP) and the New York Times (UPI) on June 22, 1977, a right wing terrorist group, called the White Warriors Union, has threatened to kill all Jesuits found in El Salvador after July 21. In a statement to local radio stations, this group said the execution of Jesuits will be immediate and systematic.

That this threat of the White Warriors Union must be taken seriously is clear from the following:

Facts

1. This White Warriors Union has claimed responsibility for six bombings of the Jesuit-directed Catholic university in San Salvador during the last six months.

2. The White Warriors Union has admitted responsibility for kidnapping and killing Fr. Alfonso Navarro, a diocesan priest, May 11, in retaliation for the assassination of the Salvadoran Foreign Minister, Mauricio Borgonovo, whose death they blamed on the Jesuits.

3. A Jesuit priest, Fr. Rutilio Grande, was ambushed and murdered by machine gun on March 12th while on his way to celebrate Mass for the people of his parish in El Paisnal.

4. There has been a steadily mounting campaign of persecution against the Church and the Jesuits over the last several months during which: 7 foreign-born priests were refused re-entry permits; 8 other foreign-born priests were expelled by force; 3 priests were tortured; and 2 Salvadoran priests were assassinated.

5. The Jesuits vigorously supported the Government's efforts (in its "Agrarian Transformation Program" launched in July 1976) to redistribute the land more equitably. When the Government capitulated to pressures from powerful landowners, however, and reduced this program to ineffectiveness, Jesuits strongly criticized both the Government and the powerful landowners.

6. El Salvador has the highest population density of any Latin American country and yet less than 1% of the population controls almost 40% of the arable land. Impoverished peasants (90% of the farms) control only 1/4 of the arable land. More land is used for export products than for local consumption.

7. The recent escalation in frequency and ferocity of attacks on the Jesuits and the Church in general are due to the fact that these emerged as staunch defenders of civil liberties and human rights, especially for the poor. This has made them the target of calumnies, threats, expulsions, assassinations and, most recently, targets for outright elimination.

Purpose.—These facts are presented in order to enlist strong representation by the highest agencies of the U.S. Government, American civic and Church leadership, the media and other to the Government of El Salvador to protest the injustices noted above and the increasing climate of violence.

Jesuit Conference, June 28, 1977.

[Press Release of Jesuit Conference, Washington, D.C., dated July 11, 1977]

VANCE ASKED TO PROTEST PERSECUTIONS IN EL SALVADOR

Secretary of State Cyrus Vance met last Friday, July 8, with a group of leading Churchmen who urged that the United States government make a formal protest to the government of El Salvador for violations of human rights and persecution of the Churches.

Archbishop Joseph L. Bernardin, President of the National Conference of Catholic Bishops, and Dr. William P. Thompson, President of the National Council of the Churches of Christ, were among those who joined Father James L. Connor, S.J., President of the United States Jesuit Conference, in requesting this meeting. The request was made in specific reaction to a threat of June 20 by a right-wing group called the "White Warriors' Union" to kill any Jesuit found in El Salvador after July 20. Forty-seven Jesuits now work in El Salvador.

The El Salvadoran government, the Churchmen charged, is at least tolerating this outrageous threat, as it has apparently tolerated or abetted numerous instances of human rights' violations over the past nine months, ranging from harassment to murder. In support of this conviction, Mr. Vance was given careful and extensive documentation prepared in El Salvador.

Mr. Vance and five other high-ranking officials of the State Department met with Monsignor Francis J. Lally, Secretary, Department of Social Development and World Peace, U.S. Catholic Conference; Dr. William P. Thompson, President, National Council of the Churches of Christ; Mr. Thomas Quigley, Advisor for Latin American Affairs, U.S. Catholic Conference; Dr. William L. Wipfler, Director for Human Rights, National Council of the Churches of Christ; Rev. Timothy S. Healy, S.J., President, Georgetown University; and Rev. James L. Connor, S.J., President, Jesuit Conference.

The group presented Mr. Vance with copies of a strongly-worded statement of Archbishop Bernardin deplored the persecution of the Catholic Church in El Salvador for its efforts on behalf of social justice.

"The lines have been sharply etched" in El Salvador, the Archbishop says, with "the landless peasants and the ministers of the Church" on one side and "the national security forces and the landed oligarchy" on the other. "In few other countries today has the Church's pastoral ministry been met with such intense and organized opposition. . . . The tiny minority of rich and powerful, zealous guardians of a sterile and unjust *status quo*, have not hesitated to employ every means at their disposal to obstruct the preaching of the Gospel."

From a "Fact Sheet" prepared by the Jesuit Conference for this occasion, Mr. Vance was reminded of some details in this escalating persecution: the Jesuit-run Catholic University has been bombed six times; seven foreign-born priests have been refused re-entry permits; eight other foreign-born priests were expelled by force; three priests have been tortured; two Salvadoran priests have been killed; and now forty-seven Jesuits are threatened with assassination by July 20th.

While the churches in El Salvador support the struggle of the poor for a more equitable share in land and opportunity, the Churchmen told Vance, the entrenched minority of powerful land-owners and industrialists fights back under the anonymous cloak of "private" organizations such as the "White Warriors' Union." Killing Jesuits is simply a means to hold peasants in continuing economic thraldom.

The U.S. Churchmen based this analysis on reliable evidence: a Pastoral Message of May 17, 1977, issued by the El Salvadoran Catholic Bishops' Conference: "In the name of God, we call urgently and anxiously for peace and unity. Let the systematic campaign of calumny and defamation of the Church cease—defamation and calumny which are now being directed against some national and foreign priests, as well as the Society of Jesus and the Salvadoran Episcopacy. It is a campaign which, directed from the shadow of anonymity, tries to choke off and silence the voice of the Church and justify the most reprehensible violations of human rights."

In support of the bishops and his fellow Jesuits, the Jesuit Superior General, Father Pedro Arrupe sent on July 1 a personal telegram from Rome to the new El Salvadoran President, Carlos Romero. "Referring to your noble desire to guarantee human rights," wrote Father Arrupe, "I ask you earnestly to protect my Jesuit brothers, threatened with death by the Union Guerrera Blanca. Do not permit innocent blood to stain once again the generous Salvadoran nation."

The Church group meeting with Mr. Vance was reportedly very pleased that he showed genuine concern for the situation in El Salvador. Moreover, they were left with the clear understanding that the State Department would take meaningful action to influence favorably the current course of events. Mr. Vance invited and the participants pledged continued, practical collaboration toward this end.

EXCERPTS FROM A REPORT ENTITLED "BRIEF ANALYSIS OF THE PRESENT CRITICAL SITUATION IN EL SALVADOR SINCE THE AGRARIAN REFORM," PREPARED BY CHURCHPEOPLE IN EL SALVADOR

THE ROLE OF THE CHURCH IN CURRENT CONFLICTS IN EL SALVADOR

a. Agrarian Reform

On the part of the Church there has been no other position than that of the University of José Simeón Cañas (UCA), which already in the first days of July (1976), publicly announced its support of Agrarian Reform, but not with the same objective the Government had in mind. Nevertheless, in the mind of public opinion, this appeared as support of the Government.

Later, UCA prepared a special issue [of its journal, ECA] analyzing Agrarian Reform in which an editorial continued support for Agrarian Reform. After the session of the Government on October 20, ECA/UCA published an editorial in November -- "At Your Orders, My Capital" -- in which it denounced the dictatorship of the Upper Class or the rich. Finally, in January, ECA/UCA published an analysis in two articles on how the Law of Agrarian Reform had been emasculated. In all this confrontation, UCA stood alone, even counting the fact that BPR included it [UCA] in its attacks on the Government and ANEP. The BPR accused it of defending a purely reformist means.

Some of the clergy of San Miguel and Usulután, conceding some credibility to the Government, got together with functionaries of ISTA to gauge the extent of the Agrarian Reform and to take some steps.

b. Seizure of the Quezaltepeque City Hall and the Violent Death of Orellana

The actual situation of El Salvador, once the goal of reform was rejected, grew more serious and, simultaneously, the confrontations sharpened. The Popular Revolutionary Block announced in November a program of recovery, principally of salaries, with regard to the harvest of products for export. In this situation and in its aggravation, the pastoral strategy of the Church was inserted which recognized, each time with greater force, the claims of the campesinos to their own organizations and demanded conditions of greater justice in the country. On the other hand, in a situation like this, where the State has rejected the reforms, there were few ways left open, outside of repression.

In this context, and to support its program of recovery, four simultaneous demonstrations of BPR were held in the Provinces. The 14th of November, at one of the demonstrations in Quezaltepeque, the Municipal Police intervened by arresting some of the demonstrators. To prevent their possible disappearance, the organized campesinos stormed the city hall and freed them. The result was one killed and several wounded.

November 29th, on the La Paz farm (Tecolulca), right after a confrontation for the rejection of low salaries, one vigilante of the ranch died violently.

On December 5th, organized campesinos demonstrated on the Colima plantation (Suchitoto) to demand resettlement of the tenant farmers affected by the flooding of Cerro Grande. There occurred the violent death of the plantation owner, Edward Orel-lana, still not investigated.

In the face of these events, sometimes unavoidable in such a sharp confrontation, the economically dominant forces of the country launched a campaign of attack against the campesino organizations, whose power they were discovering. At the same time, they attacked the Church ("third world priests") as the instigators of these acts of violence.

In this critical moment, the Archbishop reacted with a forceful press release, which rejected the accusations and went to the root of the events: a situation of injustice and of sin which affected the weakest or the majority of the country. Also a "Coordinating Committee of the Clergy" came out publicly against the false accusations against the Church and the priests. Both communiqués, that of the Archbishop and that from the clergy, provoked an even stronger attack in the press by private enterprise, especially FARO. There is no need to overlook the fact that the victory over the Government in the Agrarian Reform conflict gave the economic forces a power to control the State which they are still exercising.

At this critical juncture, and especially around Christmas, one could see a lack of harmony among the positions of the different dioceses. The Santa Ana diocese emphasized the autonomy of each bishop and, together with the San Vicente diocese, denounced the positions of FECCAS and UTC. The diocese of San Vicente affirmed that, if it is proven that any priest is animating and orienting these organizations, he would fall under the jurisdiction of the courts of justice, because he has placed him-

self outside the law and his priestly ministry. The diocese of Santa Ana affirmed that there are groups of radicalized priests and religious who are fomenting class struggle among the campesinos. These declarations were perceived by FARO as demonstrative of a division within the Salvadorean Church and they were subsequently used in a new attack against the Church which attempted to use the well-known strategy of dividing it: "FARO has never attacked the Catholic Church nor the clergy, but only those evil priests who dedicate themselves to politics or guerrilla warfare." In the concrete, they attacked once again the Archbishop and "some Jesuit priests in complicity with high ecclesiastical dignitaries," such as the rural pastors of the Archdiocese.

Within this critical period is situated the December 3rd explosion of the sixth bomb against UCA, the most powerful one, in the Administration building, for which the UGB took responsibility.

Most probably as a consequence of the increased pressure from economically dominant groups, especially from FARO, the Government began in January, as a concession to these groups, the persecution against the Church. The tactics which this persecution would reveal can be explained in this way: proceed by striking the Church at its weakest points, the ones less easy to defend, even as far as assassinating Fr Grande; thus it will begin with people very involved with the Church, but in the process of leaving a religious order (the two Jesuit ex-seminarians) and then move on to the capture and expulsion of foreign priests and then to the capture, torture and assassination of native priests. Simultaneous with these successive strikes there would be a campaign of character assassination by the press, which would create an image of guilt of the Church in the mind of public opinion. All in all, 10 persons more or less related to the clergy were touched: 2 Jesuit seminarians in the process of leaving the Order, 5 foreign priests (one of them a Jesuit ex-priest, but treated by the Government as a priest and a Jesuit), all of these expelled and the last two tortured, 1 native priest arrested and tortured and 2 native priests, one of them a Jesuit, assassinated: 10 in all. These actions must be seen as an experiment which would test the ability of the Church to react.

From January 5th to February 22nd there was no reaction of public protest on the part of the Church. We found ourselves

in the period of greatest weakness of the Church, provoked-- first--by a certain sensation of being little affected by the first cases, and -- later -- by the weakness peculiar to the transition period between the two Archbishops (February 8-22). It cannot be forgotten that, in the case of the two Jesuit ex-seminarians, the campesino organizations recognized (by their public protests against their expulsion) that they were collaborators. FARO -- on January 15th -- generalized this acknowledgement to all the Jesuits. Precisely at this time there was discussed in the pastoral strategy of the Archdiocese the problem of collaboration of priests with these organizations already autonomous with respect to the Church.

The single important public reaction of the Church was regional: it occurred in the Vicariate of Quezaltepeque with the concelebration of Apopa in protest against the expulsion of Fr. Mario Bernal; during this ceremony occurred the sermon of Fr. Grande and the handing out of a mimeographed communiqué analyzing the persecution of the Church.

Nor was there any reaction to the bombing of the rectory of Fr. Navarro and the machine-gunning of the parish of Opico. In this context took place the kidnapping and assassination of Mr. Poma, who could have endured still more the positions of the Government.

c. Elections, Fraud and Subsequent Repression

On February 21st, already after the elections, the Government arrested and the security branches tortured Fr. Barahona. In the face of his inability to communicate with the authorities, Bp. Chávez decided to bring about the change of Archbishop on February 22. This very day appeared the first official reaction of the Church (communiqué of the Archdiocesan's Chancery protesting the expulsion of priests and denying the accusations against them). On this same day the Episcopal Conference met with the Nuncio and the President and the High Command. At this meeting there were made known the lists of priests to whom re-entry into the country would not be permitted and of priests over whom hung a warning of expulsion; by this means were 7 other priests of the Archdiocese (3 of them nationalized citizens) de facto surrendered for expulsion at least temporarily. In this dialogue was obtained the release of Fr. Barahona, but the representative of San Vicente diocese signed a

statement that the National Guard had released him unharmed, though it was published in the press that he had been tortured.

On February 25th, facing threats of expulsion (later revoked through the intervention of the Archbishop) the Benedictine Fr. John Murphy had to leave the country for having already made some declarations to the N.Y. Times.

In the repression against UNO at Liberty Plaza (February 28) the Fathers of the Rosary Basilica opened the doors of the Church to serve as a refuge; furthermore, Bp. Chávez and Bp. Rivera Damas mediated in the eviction of the refugees and by securing guarantees of protection. The Mass of Fr. Navarro.

This same day, in a meeting of the clergy, it was decided to initiate press releases from the Archbishopric; in the first release was recalled the excommunication which falls on whoever lays violent hands on a priest or religious.

On March 4th the National Guard and ORDEN tried to arrest Fr. Rutilio Sanchez, but they failed thanks to the reaction of the people, and they plundered the house of 4 seminarians who were living in the same parish of San Martín. They reacted with a press release. March 5th the Permanent Committee of the Episcopal Conference signed the "Message on the Present Moment which the Country is Experiencing." This was a moment of great import.

On March 10th was held a meeting of the clergy of the Archdiocese to discuss the possible means of protecting foreign priests. In workshops was seen the necessity of matching forces with the Government and finding mechanisms for reacting; they spoke of a Pastoral Letter to clarify the questions of Faith and Political Action, of the possibility of closing of high schools and churches.

d. Assassination of Fr. Grande

With this assassination begins a new stage in the reaction of the Church. It is a question of a period in which she reacts with firmness, with great unity, and without permitting any equivocation of facts to pass without a response.

The principal instances of this reaction are: special programs of YSAX during several days following the very night

of the assassination; the funeral in the Cathedral and the solemn procession through the streets of San Salvador, Aguilares and El Paisnal in the middle of a State of Siege; the emergence of great unity among the Archbishop, the Auxiliary Bishop, the clergy, religious and Christian people; the courage and clarity of the weekly Orientación; continual press releases of the Archbispopric; closing of the Catholic high schools and of UCA for three days, accompanied by reflection on the events and on the faith of the Church (Vatican II, Medellín, etc.); the Single Mass on Sunday, March 20. A very important result was to emphasize the firmness of the Archbishop in sticking to his pastoral decisions in the face of numerous pressures, even those from the diplomatic sectors.

In this context we must understand the decision of the Archbishop to travel to Rome to share personally with the Holy Father his pastoral strategy. The support which he encountered there greatly strengthened his ecclesial position henceforth.

The whole of Holy Week was focussed, with prior work in committees, toward Christian reflection on these events.

It can be said that from this moment on (even though the Message of the Episcopal Conference was signed on March 5, it could be read only on the 13th), the Church was perceived as a firm defender of civil liberties and human rights.

e. Kidnapping and Death of Chancellor Borgonovo

Even before the kidnapping and death, the outlines of a new confrontation were discernible, on the heels of diverse land seizures by campesinos desperate from hunger and lack of land. At the same time (in reality already since March 19) the attacks of FARO against the Jesuits were increased; this same organization accused the Archbishop of being linked with the land seizures, implying in its charge new accusations against priests and a rejection of the documents of Medellín.

The Archbishop agreed to be a mediator between campesinos and landholders, achieving success in the case of the three in question. Meanwhile Masses were celebrated at the sites where land was seized.

Also, during this time there became known, especially through Orientación, the reaction of the Cardinal Archbishop of

Guatemala, who refused to intervene. In a letter restricted to his clergy but publicized by newsmen, he took a position very contrary to the position of the Archbispopric [of El Salvador] with respect to the foreign and native priests who had been beaten. The reactions were circulated throughout Central America as much because of their different sources as because of the way they were broadcast.

On Easter Sunday, the Archbishop, in his first Pastoral Letter, laid down very clearly the position of the Church and its fundamental mission.

That was the state of affairs when the action of kidnapping Minister Borgonovo took place. Two days later the UGB included the Jesuits and priests of the Block [BPR] among those responsible for the kidnapping against whom they threatened to take reprisals should the Chancellor be killed.

The Archbishop offered to mediate in this case, responding to petitions from the family. All the communiqués from the Archbispopric showed very clearly the concern of the Archbishop not only for Minister Borgonovo but also for the others imprisoned and disappeared. At the same time, the Archbishop aligned himself in complete solidarity with the threatened Jesuits and with any other priests in danger (especially Fr. José Inocencia Alas).

During this critical period until the death of Minister Borgonovo, there took place the attempt against the Criterio press (for which UGB claimed responsibility, making the Archbishop an accomplice of the FPL), the arrest and deportation of Fr. Jorge Sarsanedas, S.J., and the offical threats to shut down YSAX. In all three cases the position of the Archbishop was very firm, with his sermon of Sunday, May 8, broadcast by YSAX, as perhaps his best and clearest expression. For the first time, in the face of the lies in the case of Fr. Sarsanedas in the official communiqué announcing his expulsion, the Jesuits spoke out in a press release, which was also read over the radio by the Archbispopric.

The first days of May saw the publication of full-page ads trying to provoke a schism in the Archdiocese. They were answered by YSAX with a firmness which consolidated unity within the Archdiocese.

May 10 it was announced that Minister Borgonovo was assassinated by the forces of FPL. May 11 the UGB assassinated Fr. Alfonso Navarro.

The reaction against Fr. Navarro's assassination must be distinguished. The Government found itself weakened in its legitimacy because of the fraud, by the bloody repression of February 28 and by the same reaction to the assassination of Fr. Grande, still left unpunished. Further it was trapped in a dead end because of its attitude toward the kidnapping of Borgonovo. International pressure and its reflection in the press would continue to grow, especially the disgust of the United States. This weakness and political insecurity would force [the Government] to rely solely on an exacerbated and disproportionate use of military force. The repressive action of May 1 demonstrated this quite clearly. Demonstrations can be broken up with attacks of water or teargas, before resorting to killing. But the Government will be prepared only for killing. In these circumstances, to convoke crowds (Single Mass in the Cathedral, funeral in the Cathedral, funeral through the streees, etc.) could be to convoke them to slaughter.

PERSECUTION AGAINST THE CHURCH

A. - Persecution of Priests

<u>Date</u>	<u>Situation</u>	<u>N A M E</u>					<u>Nationality</u>	<u>Working In</u>
		<u>N</u>	<u>A</u>	<u>M</u>	<u>E</u>			
1. 2/21/77	Refused re-entry	Fr. Benigno Fernández, S.J.					Spanish	Aguilares
2. 2/22/77	Refused re-entry	Fr. Laurence McCulloch, M.M.					United States	Opico
3. 2/22/77	Refused re-entry	Fr. Pedro Declercq, Diocesan					Belgian	Zacamil (S. Salvador)
4. 2/22/77	Refused re-entry	Fr. Juan Deplancke, Diocesan					Belgian	Meson Serpas (S. Salv.)
5. 2/22/77	Refused re-entry	Fr. Juan Ramón Vega, Diocesan					Nicaraguan	Interdiocesan Social Secretariate
6. 2/22/77	Refused re-entry	Fr. Luis de Sebastián, S.J.					Nationalized Salvadoran	UCA (S. Salvador)
7. 2/22/77	Refused re-entry	Fr. Ignacio Elacuria, S.J.					Nationalized Salvadoran	USA (S. Salvador)
8. 1/28/77	Expelled	Fr. Mario Bernal, Diocesan					Colombian	Apopa
9. 2/18/77	Expelled & tortured	Fr. Guillermo Denaux, Diocesan					Belgian	San Antonio Abad (S. Salv.)
10. 2/18/77	Expelled	Fr. Bernard Survil, M.M.					United States	Barrio Lourdes (S. Salv.)
11. 5/5/77	Expelled & maltreated	Fr. Jorge Sarsanedas, S.J.					Panamanian	San Salvador
12. 2/18/77	Expelled	Fr. John Murphy, O.S.B.					United States	Ayutuxtepeque
13. 5/19/77	Expelled & maltreated	Fr. Salvador Carranza, S.J.					Spanish	Aguilares
14. 5/19/77	Expelled & maltreated	Fr. José Luis Ortega, S.J.					Spanish	Guazapa
15. 5/19/77	Expelled & maltreated	Fr. Marcelino Pérez, S.J.					Panamanian	Aguilares

PERSECUTION AGAINST THE CHURCH (cont.):

Date	Situation	N A M E			Nationality	Working in
		N	A	M	E	
16. 3/12/77	Assassinated	Fr. Rutilio Grande, S.J.				Salvadorean
17. 5/11/77	Assassinated	Fr. Alfonso Navarro, Diocesan				Salvadorean
18. 2/21/77	Tortured	Fr. Rafael Barahona, Diocesan				Salvadorean
19. 5/19/77	Beaten	Fr. Víctor Guevara, Diocesan				Salvadorean
20. 5/20/77	Imprisoned	Fr. Antonio Vides, Diocesan				Salvadorean
21. 5/11/77	Imprisoned	Fr. Gonzalo López, Diocesan				Salvadorean
22. 5/24/77	Calumniated, threatened, left the country	Fr. Inocencio Alas, Diocesan				Salvadorean
23. 5/24/77	Calumniated, threatened, left the country	Fr. Higinio Alas, Diocesan				Salvadorean
24. 5/26/77	Calumniated, threatened, left the country	Fr. Guillermo Rodríguez, Diocesan				Salvadorean
25. 5/14/77	Threatened in public	Fr. Alejandro Bautín, O.F.M.				Italian
<u>83</u>						
<u>TO T A L S</u>						
Diocesan priests.....		13	=	52%		
Jesuits.....		8	=	32%		
Maryknollers.....		2	=	8%		
Franciscans.....		1	=	4%		
Benedictines.....		1	=	4%		
		25	=	100%		

B. Attempts Against Church or Church-related Institutions

- December, 1976 - Bombings at UCA
- January, 1977 - Military search of parish house of Opico
- March 4, 1977 - Military search of parish house of San Martín
- May 20, 1977 - Sacred vessels desecrated and Eucharist trampled upon at Aguilares parish

C. Defamation Campaign by Writings in the Press, Against Priests and the Teaching Authority of the Archbishop (May 1-31, 1977)

1. Agricultural Front of the Eastern Region (FARO): May 9, 18, 25, 26, 27, 28, 30 + 31
2. Cattleowners and Dairy farmers Association of El Salvador (AGES): May 12, 14 + 21
3. Cattleowners of La Paz: May 30
3. Ministry of Interior and Ministry of Defense: May 7 + 20
4. Fictional Associations and Persons:
 - Dr. or Prof. Aminta Amaya: May 11, 12, 13, 16, 17, 18, 20, 23, 24, 25, 26, 27 + 30
 - Association of Catholic Women: May 9, 26, 27, 29 + 31
 - Salvadorean Catholic Association: May 11, 17 + 23
 - Association of Catholic Mothers: May 9
 - Committee for Improvement of the Catholic Church: May 17, 24 + 25
 - Salvadorean Christian Society: May 27, 30 + 31
 - Salvadorean Christian Committee: May 27, 30 + 31
 - Association of Followers of Christ the King: May 28 + 30
 - Society of Christian Women: May 29
 - Fictitious Edition of the newspaper Orientación: May 29

APPENDIX 4

PRESS RELEASE OF THE MINISTRY OF DEFENSE AND PUBLIC SECURITY OF EL SALVADOR, DATED JULY 19, 1977

Having faced a variety of rumors and surmises which some unscrupulous persons have been divulging in reference with the past events of brigandage terrorism, stating that Public Security Institutions have hastily crossed their arms and abandoned investigations and search for the persons responsible of such ominous crimes, the Ministry of Defense and Public Security wishes to make the following very clear:

In the eagerness of fulfilling the principles pointed out by our Constitution, which guarantees the safety of every citizen, without distinction of political ideology, religious belief or economic condition, the Public Security Institutions are developing intensive activities in order to investigate and put at the disposition of justice, all persons or groups responsible for these unfortunate happenings which have disturbed and darkened the lives of many Salvadorean families. At the same time, will repress with energy any kind of violence and terrorism, regardless of origin, that is, either right wing, left wing or other, whichever they may be called.

Consequently, the Ministry of Defense and Public Security calls to the attention and conscience of the public in general, so that they may unite in preserving the peace and tranquility that our country deserves.

The protection of the people in their belongings is a constant preoccupation and worry of this Ministry, for such reasons the Public Security Institutions are adopting measures and procedures to eradicate crime, robbery and any violence that may endanger the security of its citizens, therefore, it reiterates the necessity for everyone to comprehend and collaborate in the fulfillment and obeisance of the requested above, for the total benefit of society in general.

—Department of Public Relations Press and Publicity.
SAN SALVADOR, *July 19, 1977.*

(85)

